1982

The Role And Primary Responsibilities Of The Program Specialist In The California Special Education Local Plan Areas: A Consensus Model

Cheryl Ann Mcelhany
University of the Pacific

The Role and Primary Responsibilities of the Program Specialist in the California Special Education Local Plan Areas: A Consensus Model

A Dissertation

Presented to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements of the Degree

Doctor of Education

By

Cheryl A. McElhany

August 1982

The Role and Primary Responsibilities of the Program Specialist in the California Special Education Local Plan Areas: A Consensus Model

Abstract

PURPOSE: The purpose of this study was to investigate the role and importance of the program specialist's position in the California Special Education Local Plan Areas and to ascertain the primary responsibilities of the program specialist's position.

PROCEDURES: Ninety-seven California Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs) were surveyed. Due to the variations in geographic size, average daily attendance, and actual years (0-5) of the SELPAs, subgroups of the study focused on the variables of size and longevity. Individuals selected to provide the data from each SELPA were its director and one program specialist designated by the director. Eighty-one SELPAs completed the SELPA Directors' Survey/Questionnaire and the Primary Responsibilities Survey. The directors' survey described the program specialist's importance to the SELPA's delivery of service. The Primary Responsibilities Survey provided data which define the primary responsiblities of the program specialist, and further clarified the program specialist's role.

FINDINGS: Data collected from survey responses by the Directors and Participating Program Specialists (PPS) were presented in narrative and tabular form. The Directors' perceived importance was synthesized to yield a Composite Rating of Program Specialists' Importance (CRPSI). The rank of 4.2, roughly "very important," was the computed CRPSI. The areas of Support and Communication received the highest rating of importance by a majority (68%) of the respondents. The variables of size and longevity did not appear to alter the CRPSI substantially.

The Participating Program Specialists' responses were tabulated and yielded a Synthesis of Program Specialist Primary Responsibilities (SPR). The SPR produced four primary responsibilities and five secondary responsibilities. The responsibility of "Consulting with Teachers" was the highest (75%) primary responsibility. The variables of size and longevity did not affect the SPR substantially, although minor differences did occur.

CONCLUSIONS: The findings of the study suggested that the program specialist's position is very important to the operation and service delivery model of the California SELPAs. Findings also support a consensual role for the program specialist with well-defined primary and secondary responsibilities. The primary responsibilities defined in the SPR substantiate the program specialist's position as that of a support service to school personnel, parents, and students.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Areas for further investigation which would contribute to this research are: 1) current school personnel perceptions of the program specialist's services, and 2) a nationwide investigation of service delivery models for comparison purposes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES vi

ABSTRACT vii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ix

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1

The Purpose of the Study 7

Objectives 8

Limitations of the Study 9

Definition of Terms 9

Assumptions 11

Delineation of the Research Program 11

Significance of the Study 12

Organization of the Remainder of the Study 14

2. A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 15

Historical Overview 16

Special Education in California Prior to the Master Plan 25

The Bureau for Educational Improvement for Handicapped Children 29

P.L. 90-35 (Educational Professions Development Act) 30

P.L. 85-296, as amended (Grants for Teaching in the Education of Handicapped Children 30

Section 6875 Grants and Section 6790 Grants 31

The California Master Plan for Special Education 31

Chapter Page

The Program Specialist's Position in the California Master Plan for Special Education 38

Differentiating Between Job and Position Description . 52

Evaluation of the Role of the Program Specialist 54

Summary 57

3. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Description of the Population 58

Description of the Survey Instruments 60

Procedures for Data Collection 61

Treatment of the Data 62

Validation and Reliability of the Instruments 63

Products of the Study 65

4. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 67

Analysis of the Directors' Survey 67

Summary of the Program Specialists' Primary Responsibilities Survey (The Primary Responsibilities Survey) 71

Synthesis of the Program Specialists' Primary Responsibilities (SPR) 71

Chapter Summary 76

5. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS 78

Findings of the Directors' Survey 78

The Composite Ratings of Program Specialists' Importance (CRPSI) 81

The CRPSI as it is Affected by ADA, Geographic Size and Longevity 83

Findings of the Primary Responsibilities Survey . . . 84

Chapter Page

Synthesis of the Program Specialists' Primary Responsibilities (SPR) 86

Secondary Responsibilities for the SPR 88

SPR by Variable Subgroups 89

Recommendations for Further Research 93

Potential Contribution to the Educational Field 94

REFERENCES 95

APPENDICES

A. SELPA Directors' Survey/Questionnaire 102

B. Primary Responsibilities of the Program Specialists' Survey 104

C. Follow-up Procedure for the SELPA Directors' Questionnaire 111

D. Panel of Representative Authorities for content Validation of Instruments 112

E. Letter to Special Education Authorities in the Field for Instrument Validation 113

F. Summary of Findings for Personnel Preparation 114

G. Summary of Findings on Program Services and Effects . . . 115

H. Summary of the Program Specialists' Primary Responsibilities Survey 116

I. The "Other" Section Responses of the Primary Responsibilities of the Program Specialist Survey 120

EXHIBIT A Consensus Model of the Program Specialist's Role and Position Description 91

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	Survey of Program Specialist Demographics	40
3.1	Numbers of SELPAs Sampled, Categorized by ADA, Georgraphic Size, and Longevity	59
3.2	Data Collection Timeline	62
3.3	Pre-Post Administrations of the Directors' Survey and Program Specialists' Survey	65
4.1	Summary of the Program Specialists' Importance to the SELPA Operation	69
4.2	CRPSI Categorized by Variable Groupings of ADA, Geographic Size and Longevity	70
4.3	Synthesis of the Program Specialists' Primary Responsibilities (SPR) (N=81)	73
4.4	Synthesis of the Program Specialists' Responsibilities Classified by ADA, Geographic Size (Geog.) and Longevity	75

The Role and Primary Responsibilities of the Program Specialist in the California Special Education Local Plan Areas: A Consensus Model

Abstract

PURPOSE: The purpose of this study was to investigate the role and importance of the program specialist's position in the California Special Education Local Plan Areas and to ascertain the primary responsibilities of the program specialist's position.

PROCEDURES: Ninety-seven California Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs) were surveyed. Due to the variations in geographic size, average daily attendance, and actual years (0-5) of the SELPAs, subgroups of the study focused on the variables of size and longevity. Individuals selected to provide the data from each SELPA were its director and one program specialist designated by the director. Eighty-one SELPAs completed the SELPA Directors' Survey/Questionnaire and the Primary Responsibilities Survey. The directors' survey described the program specialist's importance to the SELPA's delivery of service. The Primary Responsibilities Survey provided data which defined the primary responsibilities of the program specialist, and further clarified the program specialist's role.

FINDINGS: Data collected from survey responses by the Directors and Participating Program Specialists (PPS) were presented in narrative and tabular form. The Directors' perceived importance was synthesized to yield a Composite Rating of Program Specialists' Importance (CRPSI). The

rank of 4.2, roughly "very important," was the computed CRPSI. The areas of Support and Communication received the highest rating of importance by a majority (68%) of the respondents. The variables of size and longevity did not appear to alter the CRPSI substantially.

The Participating Program Specialists' responses were tabulated and yielded a Synthesis of Program Specialist Primary Responsibilities (SPR). The SPR produced four primary responsibilities and five secondary responsibilities. The responsibility of "Consulting with Teachers" was the highest (75%) primary responsibility. The variables of size and longevity did not affect the SPR substantially, although minor differences did occur.

CONCLUSIONS: The findings of the study suggested that the program specialist's position is very important to the operation and service delivery model of the California SELPAs. Findings also support a consensual role for the program specialist with well-defined primary and secondary responsibilities. The primary responsibilities defined in the SPR substantiate the program specialist's position as that of a support service to school personnel, parents, and students.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Areas for further investigation which would contribute to this research are: 1) current school personnel perceptions of the program specialist's services, and 2) a nationwide investigation of service delivery models for comparison purposes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge a number of people who assisted me in completing my dissertation. I am grateful for the cooperation of the San Joaquin Special Education Service Region and particularly its director, Peter Gonos, who co-sponsored this study and supported its efforts.

A warm thank you to Dr. Ann Zinck and Dr. Bobby Hopkins for their assistance and consultation in the statistical analysis of this study. I wish to thank Dr. Robert Morrow, my committee chairman, for his guidance and support. I am grateful to all my committee members for their guidance and patience. And, to Margaret Bettencourt, my typist, for her constant support and enthusiasm in spite of the continual typing and retyping involved.

A special thank you to my ex-husband, Dale. Although we have both chosen different paths in life, this study and the doctoral degree would not have been possible without his support.

And lastly, a final thank you to my Mom and Dad who sacrificed greatly to put me through undergraduate school. It was their motivation, ambition and aggressiveness in their own professions that influenced my pursuit and actualization of this degree.

I dedicate this dissertation to Marin Ardis McElhany, my three-year-old daughter who I pray will strive to even higher levels than I have attained. Through her I have learned that one never really reaches his/her potential, and, one really can do two, maybe three or four things at once if the desire is strong enough.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

One of the most comprehensive pieces of legislation affecting the nation is the Education for All Handicapped Children's Act (Public Law 94-142) passed in 1975. This law is the culmination of court cases and lobby group activities which reported many facts, among which was that out of the nation's eight million handicapped children, four million were not receiving appropriate educational services, and one million were receiving no services at all. Although the education of children is a state responsibility, the federal government does institute legislation to effect change in cases where national security or public welfare is affected. Desegregation, War on Poverty's Head Start and Title I funding, and Vocational Rehabilitation are, for example, representative of federal intervention. For similar purposes, Congress passed P.L. 94-142 which mandated that each state must ensure a free, appropriate education for all of its handicapped individuals, ages 3-21 years. Moreover, this legislation was designed to provide states with financial assistance so that they can serve handicapped children in the schools. However, in order to qualify for the federal monetary support, states must comply with specific federal regulations.

To gain eligibility and comply with the federal mandates, most states have developed a statewide plan for the implementation of P.L. 94-142. California's implementation program is called the Master Plan

for Special Education, commonly called "The Master Plan."

California's first implementation of the Master Plan took place in 1975 with the funding of six pilot service regions complying with the Master Plan guidelines. A service region, now called a Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA), is the school district(s) and/or county office(s) of education organized within a geographic area to coordinate the administration and delivery of special education services (Senate Bill 1870, Rodda, 1980). Other service regions have been added yearly with total district compliance to be reached by 1983.

As is often the case in massive educational changes or implementations, P.L. 94-142 has created a need for additional educators who possess special expertise and training. A specific job, the Program Specialist, was mandated in California legislation as early as 1974 with Assembly Bill 4040. Subsequent legislation, A.B. 1250 (1977), A.B. 3635 (1978), S.B. 1870 (1980), also included this position.

Because of the special qualifications required of program specialists in the Master Plan, the position has gained professional status in the school districts and service regions. In part, this status grew out of the following excerpt from the Master Plan itself:

> A program specialist is a specialist who holds a valid special education credential, clinical services credential, health services credential, or a school psychologist authorization and has advanced training and related experience in the education of individuals with exceptional needs and specialized indepth knowledge in preschool handicapped, career/vocational development, or one or more areas of major handicapping conditions [Senate Bill 1870, Section 56368. Rodda, 1980].

Along with professional status, a higher salary status than the

classroom teacher has been established in most districts and service regions. This increase in salary was deemed appropriate because the California Education Code mandates that the program specialist shall be a pupil services employee. It is stated in the code that a pupil services employee is:

> . . . an employee of a school district, employed in a position requiring a standard designated services credential, health and development credential, or a librarian credential, and who performs direct services to pupils [California Administrative Code, Section 33150(e)].

In order to meet this demand, many districts and/or service regions require additional qualifications such as a master's degree and/or an administrative credential.

A preliminary examination of 15 job descriptions from various SELPAs in California indicated, however, that program specialists' duties have some variance. Some responsibilities listed on the job descriptions closely resembled, or were identical to those of administrators. For example, Vallejo City Unified School District's job description stated the program specialist will, "direct and coordinate the development of programs for the severely handicapped," and "supervise teachers of the severely handicapped to ensure compliance with required annual review." The job description for El Dorado County stated that the program specialist is "directly responsible for the supervision and evaluation of assigned certificated and classified staff." Other responsibilities listed on the job descriptions indicated more direct services to teachers and students, such as "model teaching" and "weekly consultation to teachers [Kern County]."

While there appeared to be differences, similarities also existed. The service of consultation appeared as a responsibility for the program specialist on 12 of the 15 pilot job descriptions examined. The responsibility of coordination of curricular resources was common, also. Therefore, although some of the specific duties differed, there was some unity to the role. The role was agreed upon by some counties, such as Shasta and Humboldt, which utilized their program specialists primarily as consultants and facilitators. Other service regions, such as Placer-Nevada County and Redding, utilized the program specialists as supervisors and program evaluators.

More recent legislation, S.B. 769 (1981), further clarified the program specialist's position by adding that the program specialist will:

(1) Observe, consult with, and assist resource specialists, designated instruction and services instructors, and special class teachers.

(2) Plan programs, coordinate curricular resources, and evaluate effectiveness of programs for individuals with exceptional needs.

(3) Participate in each school's staff development, program development, and innovation of special methods and approaches.

(4) Provide coordination, consultation and program development primarily in one specialized area or areas of his or her expertise.

(5) Be responsible for assuring that pupils have full educational

opportunity regardless of the district of residence.

Current legislation suggested that the program specialist was a provider of support services to school personnel as opposed to direct service to children. This lack of direct service has produced criticism in legislative hearings and a reluctance to allocate educational monies for indirect rather than direct service to children (Senate Bill 769, Sieroty, hearings August 21-24 , 1981). Other examples of persons who provide indirect educational services might be school psychologists, curriculum coordinators, and staff development administrators. During the aforementioned S.B. 769 hearings, the program specialist's role and functions were considered undefined and unnecessary by some legislators. A move to change the wording in the law from "A program specialist shall (emphasis added) be provided for every 560 special education students" to "A program specialist may (emphasis added) be provided" took place. Such a decision would have changed a position from mandatory to optional. Because of strong opposition by the Council of Exceptional Children (CEC), California Teachers Association (CTA), and California Association of Program Specialists (CAPS), the wording remained as "shall (emphasis added)." However, the number of students requiring one program specialist was changed from 560 to 850, thus diffusing the impact of the program specialist. This issue may influence the localizing effect of special education, as well as inhibiting the clarity of the program specialist's role.

In 1979, the Stanford Research Institute (SRI) was contracted by the California State Department of Education to evaluate the Master

Plan. A section of the SRI study dealt with the effectiveness of the Master Plan personnel. A second study, also contracted by the State Department of Education and done by the University of California, Santa Barbara, focused on the role of the program specialist. Both of these studies will be discussed in the literature review for the present study.

The SRI evaluation provided data supportive of the program specialist's role as consultant, coordinator and facilitator. School personnel who had the closest contact with program specialists, such as principals, special day class teachers, and resource specialists, viewed the role as a supportive one to their own function in the Master Plan implementation. Several regional directors and district administrators viewed the program specialist as their only means of assuring compliance and on-going communication of the implementation process.

Along with this evaluative information, the U.C., Santa Barbara study provided statistics concerning personal demographics, role demographics, training and experience, role functioning, job satisfaction, and school personnel's perceptions of the program specialist's role. Such information, although collected two years ago, was considered along with the data collected in this study for defining the functions of the program specialist.

In addition, research collected to evaluate the effectiveness of the Individual Educational Program (IEP) in the Master Plan revealed considerable frustration with the lack of sufficient personnel to facilitate the process of integrating special education students into

regular classrooms. This suggests that teachers and other school personnel either were not benefiting from the services provided by support personnel, such as the program specialist, or they were calling for an increase in these services (Zinck et al., 1980).

The Purpose of the Study

While information and data now exist which describe various roles and functions of the program specialist, a call for unity of role and functions, more direct service to students and teachers, and a strong justification for the role's existence have developed. Special Education Administrators of County Offices (SEACO), CAPS, CEC, CTA and proposed legislation (Senate Bill 769 amendments) are addressing these issues on their agenda during this year. The California State Department of Education has requested SEACO to submit a position paper regarding the role of the program specialist by mid-1982 (McGuckin, 1981). CEC and CTA have actively encouraged CAPS and/or SEACO to elect or designate one bargaining unit for all program specialists which might help unify the role. There appears to be a general consensus by the groups mentioned that if the role and functions gain consistency, such clarification may justify the role's inclusion in the special education service delivery model. There is also agreement that an evaluation of the role's importance would not only assist in clarification, but also provide needed information regarding the position's impact on the SELPA delivery of service.

In view of the need for clarity and consensus of role, it was the purpose of this study to investigate the role and importance of the

program specialist's position in California in order to answer the following questions:

(1) What are the primary responsibilities of the program specialist in California?

(2) To what extent do the primary responsibilities of the program specialist generate a generalized role?

(3) Is the program specialist's role related to differences among SELPAs, such as, the variables of:

(a) SELPA ADA

(b) Geographic size

(c) Number of years SELPA has employed program specialists (longevity)?

(4) How important is the program specialist's role to the effectiveness of the SELPA's operation in the areas of:

(a) Meeting compliance

(b) Coordination

(c) Communication

(d) Effectiveness

(e) Efficiency

(f) Expertise

(g) Support

and is this importance related to size (geographic and population) and/or program specialist's longevity?

Objectives

To answer the questions of this study, the following objectives

were proposed:

(1) To isolate the primary responsibilities performed by the program specialist and investigate role commonality.

(2) To identify differences in program specialist roles in relation to SELPA size (geographic size/population) and/or the number of years program specialists have been employed.

(3) To determine the importance of the program specialist's role to the SELPA's operation as perceived by its director.

Limitations of the Study

This study was directed to a participating program specialist for each SELPA and the directors of all 97 California SELPAs. Other school personnel were not surveyed in this study because their perceptions were reported in previous studies (Campbell, 1981; SRI, 1980).

Definition of Terms

Communication - The process of interchanging ideas and information in an on-going manner (Good, 1973).

Compliance - Assuring that all state and federal regulations are followed and adhered to pertaining to an appropriate educational program in the least restrictive education environment (Title V Regulations for Senate Bill 1870).

Coordination - The process of unifying the contributions of people, materials, and other resources toward the achievement of a recognized purpose (Good, 1973).

Effectiveness - The producing of a desired outcome or power to produce desired outcomes (Kelly & Vergason, 1978).

Efficiency - The ability to achieve desired results with economy of time and effort in relation to the amount of work accomplished (Good, 1973).

Expertise - Having, involving, or displaying special skill or knowledge derived from training or experience (Woolf, 1982).

Individuals With Exceptional Needs (IWENs) - Those individuals who have been identified by an individualized education program team as a handicapped student as the term is defined in Title 20 of the United States Code, 1980 (Senate Bill 1870, Section 56026, Rodda, 1980).

Job Description - Term used in vocational guidance to describe the important characteristics of a job and the worker characteristics required for effective job performance (Page & Thomas, 1977).

Longevity - The length of time or number of years one has served in a specific position. For purposes of this study, longevity will be the term used for the number of years the SELPA has employed program specialists.

Primary responsibilities - Those duties, requirements, and/or expectations assigned to a member of a work organization for the majority of his/her day, week, month, etc. (Councel & Clavering, 1977).

Role - The behavior which is expected of an individual who occupies a certain position (status) in the provision of service to others (Collins et al., 1973).

Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) - The school district(s) and/or county offices of education organized within a geographic area to coordinate the administration and delivery of special education

services (Senate Bill 1870, Rodda, 1980).

Assumptions

An assumption was made that the best person to evaluate the program specialist's effect on the SELPA's compliance is the SELPA's director. The director is typically the program specialist's supervisor as well as the person having first-hand data and knowledge regarding the SELPA's progress in meeting compliances.

A second assumption was made that the best person to provide an account of what program specialists actually do is a program specialist him/herself. Also, most program specialists, although their specific expertise may vary, generally follow the same role within a SELPA, unless job descriptions make a distinct designation. Therefore, a participating program specialist from each SELPA could provide the data for role consensus.

Delineation of the Research Problem

It is obvious from examining maps and ADA figures that the California SELPAs are quite diverse in geographic size as well as population. Individual reports by program specialists are recorded in a Demographic Information Survey (Cook, 1981). Many program specialists claimed that "hours behind the wheel [p. 1]," indicative of travel time, consumed the largest percentage of their rime. Others reported that so many individuals or groups requested their time that priority lists were essential. Therefore, it is suggested that the variables of geographic size and ADA affect the role of the program specialist.

As with any position one enters, the first year is often a learning experience. With a position as new as the program specialist, it is suspected that one functions quite differently in his/her second, third, or fourth year than he/she did in his/her first year. In view of this supposition, it is suggested that the variable of the number of years the program specialist has been employed also affects the role of the program specialist. The research problem of this study, determining the program specialist's importance and developing a consensual role, was expanded by investigating the relationship between the role and the above-indicated variables.

Significance of the Study

Legislation passed in July, 1980, required that by the end of the 1982-83 school year all California school districts would be in compliance with the Master Plan for special education. Part of this compliance required all districts to be or be part of a SELPA. Each SELPA was to hire a program specialist for each 850 certified special education students.

In view of the problems facing special education now and as predicted, there may be a decrease in federal involvement and a sharp decline in state spending which means SELPAs will be attempting to provide the same or better services to children with a leaner budget. Since the largest expenditure in education is for personnel, all positions, including the program specialists, will be under close scrutiny to determine just what and how many positions are truly needed

for appropriate service.

Three publications, previously mentioned, have indicated a need for the program specialist position. The Master Plan clearly supported the need by mandating that the position(s) be part of each SELPA's service plan. It was recognized at its inception that in order to implement a change in the educational environment for many of California's special education children by following the concept of least restrictive environment, support personnel were essential. It was also apparent that personnel with advanced training and expertise should be utilized in a consultation and facilitation capacity. Thus, the program specialist position was defined and implemented. However, in view of the literature written just prior to and in the course of writing the Master Plan by such experts as Reynolds (1973), Cruickshank & Johnson (1975), and Griffing (1970), it appeared there was more clarity and support regarding such a role as program specialist before it was implemented than there is now.

With this ambiguity surrounding the program specialist's position, future legislation may affect the mandate for the role. Legislators, unlike school personnel, appear to know very little about what program specialists do, and either they are not familiar with the school's support of this position or they do not agree with that support. Whatever the viewpoint, the program specialist's position is controversial. Research which clarifies the program specialist's role and duties and provides an evaluation of the importance of the program specialist may enable decision makers to evaluate the importance of

this position. It is hoped that this study will clarify the program specialist's role, responsibilities, and perceived importance from a statewide perspective.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

The succeeding chapters of the study are organized as follows:

Chapter 2 contains the survey of related literature. It presents the historical aspects of special education which are pertinent to the evolution of the Master Plan and the program specialist's position. Litigation, legislation, and current research which have influenced the program specialist's role are discussed.

Chapter 3 describes the research methodology employed in this study. Also, the procedures for data collection and analysis are presented in this section.

Chapter 4 presents the results of the study. The results are stated in both narrative and tabular form. The final chapter, Chapter 5, is devoted to the interpretation and discussion of the results. From these, conclusions are drawn and recommendations for further study offered.

Chapter 2

A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

An investigation of the literature that pertains to and influences the program specialist's role will begin with an historical view of the prevalent philosophies and significant contributions to the decision-making process for educational personnel. Such personnel decisions have affected teacher specialization and staffing patterns in California. One such change involved the emphasis on teacher inservice and staff development which resulted in the advent of the program specialist position. Therefore, the literature pertaining to special education in California prior to the beginnings of this position will be reviewed.

The California Master Plan for Special Education (Master Plan) marked the beginning of the program specialist's position. Therefore, the Master Plan foundation and prevalent theories along with its mandates will be reviewed also. Following the Master Plan discussion, current literature concerning the program specialist's position will be discussed.

The goals of this study involved: 1) establishing a synthesized set of responsibilities for the program specialist which will in turn assist in the development of a consensual role, and 2) evaluating the importance of the program specialist as perceived by his/her immediate supervisor, the SELPA director. In view of the goals, a section in

this chapter will discuss the literature pertinent to a job/role description and also personnel evaluation.

Historical Overview

Specially trained personnel have been recommended and even required for special education programs since their inception. This is indicated in the literature as far back as the early 1900's. Grossman (1917), Goodhart (1910), and Mitchell (1916) advocated the development of teacher training programs that would 1) prepare all teachers in methods that were accommodating to all individuals, and 2) provide additional and indepth training for teachers desiring to teach exceptional children. Mackie, Dunn, & Cain (1959), in a five-year study of the Qualifications and Preparation of Teachers of Exceptional Children, stated their most significant findings as,

> . . . the confirmation of the premise that special educators will need to be prepared with distinctive knowledge, skills, and abilities in each area of exceptionality for which they carry responsibility [p. 396].

More specifically, the study indicated,

> . . . the importance of a wide range of competencies including: a) technical knowledge in the specialized area, such as a knowledge of relevant medical factors; b) ability to develop and adjust the curriculum and to use specialized teaching methods [p. 396].

The study went on to mention competencies and skills in counseling for social, emotional, and vocational development, interpretation of tests and reports, and teaming approaches.

Such emphasis on specialization became paramount in the 1950's and 1960's. Education was influenced by a general specialization

movement of society. The post-World War II era encouraged specialization in industry and science which significantly affected business and education (Cruickshank & Johnson, 1975). In view of this emphasis, the refinement of special education might be viewed as a derivative of the education specialization movement just as with many of the other areas of specialty that evolved, such as mathematics and/or reading. Schools nationwide were implementing reading laboratories and math clinics. Music and the arts were considered specialities, and schools were hiring specialists in these areas to offer regular and/or itinerant services. Teacher training programs expanded to offer specialist credentialing programs in place of elective courses. And teacher trainers and specialists began to "infiltrate" the administrative and middle management ranks of education as consultants, inservice educators, staff and program developers, curriculum coordinators, and/or supervisors. Other synonymous names are enumerated in the literature, such as resource coordinator, instructional and/or educational specialist, and diagnostician all indicative of the increase in specialization (Cruickshank & Johnson, 1975; Lerner, 1971; Goldberg, 1957).

Some authorities have reported negatively the effects of the specialization movements (Bassler, 1967; Instructor Opinion Poll, 1968) suggesting inconsistencies and inefficiencies resulting in partially-educated children. Bassler (1967), for example, claimed the "partiality" is a result of a "splinter skill process" which might be like a "cram" course in college. Cawelti's study (1967) of

innovative practices in high school in the North Central Association Accrediting Region of the United States showed a strong "bandwagon effect [p.]8]." That is, there was much haphazard adoption of new programs, particularly by larger, suburban, high-expenditure school districts. Such practices caused an imbalance in staffing which was reported in a number of states in the post-Sputnik era of new mathematics, physics, foreign languages, and advanced placement programs (Harris, McIntyre, Littleton, & Long, 1979). Gearheart (1972) felt that others have acclaimed the era and its penetration of society as an emergence from pseudo-illiteracy. He explained pseudo-illiteracy as the state of being partially educated. Furthermore, individuality was proclaimed as the foremost concept for consideration in educational planning and methodology, and thereby created a different outlook on human potential (Reynolds, 1978). Consequently, special education expanded rapidly with a view of increased hope that all children might realize their potential.

The teaching profession, like many other professions, may reflect the general state of the economy in its employment patterns. In times of high unemployment, an over-abundance of teachers has prevailed. During the depression of the 1930's, it was estimated that 40 percent of the teachers with appropriate credentials were unemployed (Harris et al., 1979). In the 1970's, with declining enrollment, the percentage was as high as 30 percent in New York and 26 percent in California (Gordon, 1967). In spite of the abundance of regular education teachers, the number of special education teachers has never been

plentiful (Wilson, 1956). During the depression of the 1930's, all teachers with special education training were reported as employed and large school districts, such as New York City, Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, and Chicago, advertised regularly for teachers with special education training (Meisgeier, 1970). Cruickshank and Johnson (1975) reported that, if a teacher so desired to work, one course in special education could qualify him/her for a special education position. This limited supply of special educators remained a problem through the 1950's for more progressive areas and large cities and has continued to be a problem up to the present in most rural areas.

Along with the limited supply of special education teachers came an insufficient supply of supervisory and support personnel familiar with special education needs. It was reported that approximately 75 percent of all special education directors had a standard administration credential which required no course work in special education at the time it was issued (Mackie and Engel, 1955; Knezevich, 1975). Today, 36 of the 50 states require one or more courses in the area of special education for their administrative credential; and most school systems provide inservice and/or increment credit for their administrators in the area of special education (Reynolds, 1978). Reynolds reported that most experts seemed to agree that as the demands for more trained personnel increased, colleges and universities could not begin to meet the needs. Just as there was a shortage of special education teachers, there was also a shortage of adequately-prepared college personnel to staff the growing number of special education preservice

programs (1973). The majority of the personnel instructing in the college special education programs came with diverse backgrounds and expertise. This could also be said of state and local administrators of special education. Therefore, the availability of competent leadership which had both graduate academic preparation and experience in special education has been limited and still remains a problem (Cruickshank & Johnson, 1975).

The preparation of teachers remains the responsibility of higher education; however, it is also recognized that teacher education does not stop after graduation. Teachers have been encouraged and even paid to continue taking classes in efforts to keep up with the innovations and variations in methodology and curriculum. With the rapidly-changing field of special education and the increased emphasis on individual needs (Public Law 94-142, 1975), the responsibility for teacher inservice education became a local responsibility mandated by the Federal Government. P.L. 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children's Act, provided monies for state and local school districts to provide inservice training. Once again, professionals with the expertise in special education and ability to provide on-going inservice training for teachers were scarce (Meyen, 1978).

By definition, any child requiring special education also requires the services of specially-trained personnel (Jordan, 1962). Prior to P.L. 94-142, the quality and the scope of help that a child received depended on the nature and circumstances of his disability, and the facilities of the school and community in which he resided, all of

which were determined at the local level. Federal and state involvement began in the 1960's as a result of parent activism and litigation (Blackhurst & Berdine, 1981).

An increasing body of case law has resulted in a significant change in the way in which the educational system relates to exceptional children. Burrello, DeYoung, and Lange (1974) viewed the litigation in special education as "a major external force which is causing the realignment of relationships between professionals and parents in the social system of the school [p. 4]." Specifically, the issues of categorization, testing, labeling, placement and the right to education have been challenged in 40 significant cases between 1967 and 1973 (Burrello et al., 1974).

The question of the right of handicapped students to a free, public education has received substantial attention in the professional literature and the popular press. Two well-publicized court cases, the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Citizens v. the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (1970) and Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia (1972), in addition to cases filed in more than 20 other states, have exerted a significant impact on forcing states to enact mandatory education. Consequently, an examination of the issues and cases presented supports the contention that litigation has functioned as a key factor in facilitating educational policy change regarding exceptional children (Turnbull & Schulz, 1977).

Legislation as far back as 1963 was concerned with the training of teachers for exceptional children. Title III of Public Law 88-164

related to the training of teachers of mentally retarded and other handicapped children, and also provided for research and demonstration projects in the education of handicapped children (Geer, Connor, & Blackman, 1965). The authorization for teacher training was as follows:

> There are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out this Act $11,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; $14,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; and $19,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966 [p. 68].

One provision authorized the Commissioner of Education to make grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing training of professional personnel to conduct training of the teachers in fields related to the education of handicapped children. He/she could make grants to these institutions to assist them in providing professional or advanced training for personnel engaged in or preparing to engage in employment as teachers of handicapped children, as supervisors of such teachers, as speech correctionists, as other specialists providing special services for the education of such children, or engaged or preparing to engage in research in fields related to education of such children. The Commissioner of Education was also authorized to make grants to State educational agencies to assist them in establishing and maintaining fellowships or traineeships for training personnel engaged or preparing to engage in employment as teachers of handicapped children or as supervisors of such teachers (Geer et al., 1965).

For most departments of special education, P.L. 88-204, the Higher

Education Facilities Act of 1963, provided a more integrated mechanism for receiving support for instructional and research facilities in all areas of handicapped education at the graduate level with regulations and appropriations defined. Federal laws passed or extended by the 88th Congress enhanced all types of programs for handicapped children. While some of the laws were not specifically written for exceptional children, they offered opportunities which special educators explored with a view toward utilizing all possible legislative benefits for handicapped children. It was particularly emphasized that special educators in colleges and universities and in state departments of education plan cooperatively and fully for the best use of training funds under P.L. 88-164.

The organizations and programs which followed P.L. 88-204 reflected an even greater emphasis on training of specialized personnel. The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped was created to help, via consultation and funding, state colleges, universities and other organizations meet the educational needs of the nation's handicapped children who require special services. The term "handicapped" in this federal legislation referred to mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled or other health impaired children. This group of children made up approximately 10 percent of the nation's school age population, or over 5,000,000 children (Martin, 1969).

The basic role of the Bureau was to serve as a catalyst for support activities designed to renew and revitalize education for the

handicapped. This was done through the support of teacher training and through cooperative work with universities and state education departments to improve the quality of that training by offering "special projects" for developing new training models [Martin, 1969, p. 38].

Created by the U.S. Commissioner of Education in January, 1967, based on a mandate from the Congress, the Bureau became operational with three basic divisions: Research, Training Programs, and Educational Services. One of the Bureau's key projects was the development of a network of Instructional Material Centers throughout the nation for teachers of the handicapped. More than 140 satellite material centers were developed from the 14 regional centers first established by the Bureau. The Bureau of Research also developed prototypes of Regional Resource Centers which were designed to assist teachers in the diagnosis and programming of education for children with especially difficult handicaps.

In addition to programs administered directly in the Bureau, there were other programs under which cooperative arrangements were made that were of great interest to those concerned with the handicapped. For example, an agreement was reached with the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development that 15 percent of their training funds were to be spent on the handicapped, particularly in helping regular educational personnel learn about the handicapped and in training professional aides.

The Bureau itself was empowered by Congress and the Executive

Branch in the last decade to administer a wide variety of authorities some of which included:

1. P.L. 90-170 -- which extended support for undergraduate and graduate training programs to over 260 colleges and universities, to provide qualified personnel to work with handicapped children.
2. Extension of media services and captioned films that provided special instructional materials to the classroom teacher or therapist.
3. Regional Resource Centers that provided consultant help and the latest methods and materials to the child and special educational teacher.

The mission of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped was to increase federal support for these and other programs. Behind the desire to boost federal support, however, was the assumption that it was to provide primarily catalytic and model value. However, its most meaningful benefit was to provide a nucleus around which expanded state and local contributions were developed to provide increased and better services for handicapped children (Martin, 1969).

Special Education in California

Prior to the Master Plan

California has long been a pioneer in the development of programs designed to meet the needs of the handicapped. This interest in special education dates back to the year 1860, when the California Institute for the Deaf and Dumb and the Blind was established in San Francisco. Additional funds were appropriated by the Legislature in

1865 for buildings, and a school was established in Berkeley in 1867 (Griffing, 1970).

In 1897 the City of Los Angeles established special classes in the public school program by opening a public day class for deaf children. This date marked the beginning of public school provisions for the handicapped child (Cruickshank & Johnson, 1975).

Other significant events in California occurred in the following years:

1907 - Legislation authorized school districts to establish a visual system of instruction for deaf pupils ages three to 21.

1916 - San Francisco established a speech correction program in public schools.

1921 - Most school districts established classes for mentally retarded children.

1926 - Hearing screening programs were initiated.

1927 - The California Legislature enacted laws allowing reimbursement to school districts for excess costs in the education of the handicapped (Griffing, 1970).

By 1940 the Education Code contained authorization for the establishment of special education programs for almost all types of physically handicapped children. The efforts of parents, teachers, agencies, and interested citizens brought programs for handicapped children into existence in many communities throughout the state. The need for leadership at the state level led to the establishment of the Bureau of Special Education in the California State Department of

Education in 1947. In 1957 the Bureau was transferred to the Division of Special Schools and Services. That Division had responsibility for the administration and supervision of the state residential schools for the deaf, blind, and neurologically handicapped. In 1961 the programs of special education in the public schools had increased in number to the point where additional bureaus became necessary. To meet this need, the Bureau for Physically Exceptional Children and the Bureau for Mentally Exceptional Children were created to serve programs for physically handicapped, mentally retarded, educationally handicapped, and gifted minors. With the growth of federal programs, a third bureau came into existence, known as the Bureau for Educational Improvement for Handicapped Children. In 1969 the title of the Division of Special Schools and Services was changed to Division of Special Education.

Educational services for the handicapped just prior to California's Master Plan followed the philosophy that schools must maintain educational programs of sufficient scope, quality, and flexibility to meet the unique needs and special abilities of all exceptional children. The State of California provided varied programs under the general direction of the Division of Special Education in the State Department of Education which are designed to assist the exceptional child in attaining the skills, attitudes, understanding, and behavior patterns necessary for him to function and participate in society to the extent his/her capacity would allow. Charles Watson, Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Chief, Division of Special

Education, as cited in Griffing (1970), defined the "exceptional child" as

> . . . one who diverges intellectually, physically, socially, or emotionally from what is considered normal growth and development so that he requires a special class or supplementary instruction and services in order to function and learn [p. v.].

Griffing (1970) reported further that a real problem in securing appropriate programs for handicapped minors existed. Keen competition was seen among numerous interested groups to initiate, expand, and improve programs for various public priorities. These programs included national defense, crime prevention, riot control, poverty reduction, unemployment, job training, pollution control, health improvement, and education.

Even within education urgent pressures existed for setting priorities. Areas of education included funding higher education, providing specialized education in the ghettos, schooling for minorities, meeting the needs of bilingual children, tailoring curriculum for the gifted and the talented, and expanding education for the handicapped. In spite of the increased effort in recent decades, fewer than 60 percent of California's exceptional minor population were enrolled in special education programs. The State appeared to be in a giant struggle to house, equip, supply, and staff the public schools to accommodate an increasing enrollment of non-handicapped minors. Therefore, educational programs for handicapped minors had to compete for funding and improvements along with all the other areas of regular education. Nevertheless, education for the handicapped did appear to

have some positive organizational influence with the development of the Bureau for Educational Improvement for Handicapped Children.

The Bureau for Educational Improvement for Handicapped Children

The Bureau for Educational Improvement for Handicapped Children administered Title VI-A (Public Law 89-750, Part A, Assistance to States for Education of Handicapped Children) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, as amended, as well as other federal aid programs for handicapped children. For example, the Bureau provided administrative, advisory, consultative, and supervisory services to the State Department of Education, county superintendents of schools, and school districts to assist these agencies to initiate, expand, and improve special education and related services to handicapped children at the preschool, elementary, and high school levels.

The California State Plan to institute the regulations of Title VI, ESEA (1967) identified five major areas of priority to focus on for improvement of services to handicapped children. They were:

1. Development of a statewide master plan for special education;
2. Strengthening of intermediate levels of operation in curriculum development and program evaluation;
3. Development of quality leadership for implementing and supervising programs;
4. Support of specific local programs which demonstrate a potential to influence statewide improvement of educational programs for the handicapped;
5. Demonstration and promotion of pioneering and experimental

programs and projects.

The Bureau administered two programs for the training of professional personnel in the education of handicapped children. Programs were categorized and described in terms of the source of funding, i.e., federal or state. It appeared that there were many sources for funding teacher preparation programs under the Bureau. Some of the more important programs are mentioned below.

P.L. 90-35 (Education Professions Development Act)

The Division of Special Education worked cooperatively with the Division of Compensatory Education on those aspects of the Education Professions Development Act that involved special education personnel. Part B-1 of the Education Professions Development Act (Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended) was the Teacher Corps program. The Bureau of Professional Development, a Division of Compensatory Education, was given reviewing and recommending responsibilities. Part B-2 of the Education Professions Development Act enabled school districts to submit projects concerned with the recruitment of and qualifying process for teachers.

Part B of the Education Professions Development Act included a requirement for a State plan. The California State plan, found in Article 3.5, and 3.6 of the Education Code, provided inservice training for teachers, teacher trainees, aides, and other school personnel (Griffing, 1970).

P.L. 85-296, as amended (Grants for Teaching in the Education of Handicapped Children)

This law provided grants to improve and expand the nation's

resources for educating handicapped children. The funds were used to prepare teachers and other professional personnel in special education for the handicapped. Two types of grants were available for full-time study during the academic year: traineeships, available for juniors and seniors; and fellowships, available for graduate study.

Special study institutes were also sponsored by the State Department of Education. These were short term (three to five days) inservice training programs. From 800 to 1,000 California teachers took part in the programs each year.

Section 6875 Grants and Section 6790 Loans

A State of California grant program was referred to as "6875 grants," as indicated in the Education Code, Sections 6875-6878. It was available to special education teachers who were assigned to teach in educationally handicapped programs.

In view of the legislation prior to the Master Plan, it appeared that it was recognized, at least at the State level, that emphasis and incentive toward staff development in the area of special education was needed. As a result, many college programs across the State showed an increase in their appropriations for special education programs (Duffy, 1971).

The California Master Plan for Special Education

The State Board of Education adopted the California Master Plan for Special Education in January 1974. The Legislature passed enabling legislation in September 1974. Actual implementation of the Master

Plan programs did not start until September 1975 since enabling legislation was passed after the 1974 school year had commenced.

During the 1979-80 school year, the Master Plan operated in nearly 25 areas in the State. Approximately 25 percent of California's handicapped students were served by Master Plan programs, while 75 percent were enrolled in categorical programs. California has maintained two separate and different special education delivery systems since 1975, (1) categorical programs, and (2) Master Plan. Both systems provide services to handicapped students and their families. Both categorical and Master Plan programs are required to meet the standards set forth in P.L. 94-142 and its accompanying regulations. Current plans call for replacing the categorical programs by 1981-82 (Keefe, Larson, & Peterson, 1979).

The Master Plan which is basically a statement of prophetic and intended public policy, was generated from federal and state laws to assure that:

1. All handicapped children receive a free and appropriate public education program,
2. Parents of exceptional students are full and equal partners in all referral, assessment, enrollment procedures and decisions.
3. Certain procedural safeguards are followed in all special education programs,
4. Individualized education programs are developed and implemented for each individual with exceptional needs [Keefe et al., p. 10].

Master Plan provided a mechanism by which persons working together as a team provide a free and appropriate public school program for all exceptional individuals. By requiring parental participation and approval of program recommendations and decisions, the Master Plan has assigned greater opportunities and responsibilities to parents than previously existed. Thus, school staff members were given new responsibilities to work with parents and professional colleagues. This assures that special education placements will not be made through an individual or unilateral decision. Those who fail to adhere to this principle can expect to meet the reality of parent-initiated due process procedures (Barbacovi, 1977).

Among administrators and board members in districts and counties which have implemented Master Plan, there is agreement that the Master Plan provided an improved program delivery system (Keefe et al. 1979). No longer must students meet the often-inflexible requirements of the categorical programs.

Master Plan further required the development of a local Comprehensive Plan for Special Education. Developing a local plan is a long and thorough process. The plan identified the programs that are to be operated, the locating of these programs, the personnel needed, and the manner in which the programs are to be managed and evaluated.

Districts and county offices under categorical special education programs are to serve an average of five to seven percent of the K-12 enrollment. In Master Plan areas, approximately 10 percent of the K-12 students are to receive one or more special education services.

> Master Plan implementers have successfully increased special education enrollment by providing added inducements of relatively inexpensive services while at the same time reducing the number of high cost special day classes (Keefe et al., p. 11].

The resource specialist program is perhaps the most visible and notable of the Master Plan programs. Under the Master Plan each regular school is to be provided with at least a part-time on-campus specialist who coordinates referrals, schedules eligibility and placement meetings, conducts educational assessments, and provides direct instruction. Resource specialists are also to assist regular classroom teachers by providing instructional materials, assist with supplemental teaching in the regular classroom and/or meet with a small group of exceptional individuals on a pull-out basis. This program was designed to be highly visible to parents and other school personnel (Meyen, 1978).

Services, such as those provided by the program specialist, speech therapy, physical and occupational therapy, adaptive physical education, home and hospital instruction, and other designated instruction and services are available under Master Plan. Often a student requires only individual and small group instruction, and need not be removed from the regular program. This then requires that the regular classroom teacher make modifications within the regular classroom. Under the categorical special education program, consultation and resources for the regular classroom teacher were not available (Reynolds, 1973).

Traditional labeling, such as Educationally Handicapped (EH) and Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR), is not necessary under Master Plan:

however, for accounting purposes, students are to be reported in the following categories: (1) Communicatively Handicapped; (2) Physically Handicapped; (3) Severely Handicapped; and (4) Learning Handicapped.

Keefe (1979) explained that the

> . . . local Comprehensive Plan required by Master Plan is a document which identifies those services and programs that will be provided in the geographic area served by the plan. The local plan identifies who does what, when they do it, and where it will be done [p. 121].

Districts that participate in a Comprehensive Plan avoid duplication of low incidence-high cost programs without the added complications of interdistrict agreements and contracts. Program and service accountability is increased because the Comprehensive Plan states which responsibilities for program operations are to be assigned to each participating district and county office. It is more probable that a full range of special education programs and services can be offered. In short, no longer need district staff say to an anguished parent, "We don't have a program." Rather, the district staff may respond, "We have an appropriate program available for your child through our Comprehensive Plan."

Another operation that is coordinated among the participating local educational agencies is staff development and inservice programs. Smaller districts could benefit because they could offer staff development services with the assurance that their programs would be equal to the special education offerings in neighboring districts.

Prescribed in P.L. 94-142 is a comprehensive system for personnel development that consists of three components: inservice training, a

personnel development plan, and dissemination. In order to implement this comprehensive system, specific criteria are to be required. Those criteria include: (a) a needs assessment; (b) innovative and experimental training programs; (c) resource utilization; (d) a plan of action; and (e) evaluation.

Warnat (1978) felt that the implementation of P.L. 94-142 would be a monumental task. For example, inservice training programs were to be provided for all personnel who were involved in an education-related capacity with the education of handicapped children. Furthermore, inservice training should focus specifically on training other than that which leads to a degree.

Warnat (1978) went on to suggest that the populations in need of training include school administrators both regular classroom and special education teachers, paraprofessionals (teacher aides and volunteers), specialists, and parents and parent surrogates. Other authorities (Meyen, 1968; Mackie et al., 1959) felt that special educators and specialists may have adequate preparation in the basics of exceptionality; however, a basic and critical training need for the remaining population is: 1) general orientation to the exceptional child and his or her educational needs, and 2) an awareness of the implications of the legal procedures, as well as to prepare them to facilitate the most appropriate placement and education environment for the handicapped child.

In efforts to meet these needs, California invested approximately five million dollars in the establishment and maintenance of the

Special Education Resource Network (SERN), a staff and program in-service organization that offers no-cost inservice and consultation to schools. A network concept exists because of the use of diversified resources across the State. SERN is staffed by personnel with experience and expertise in special education as well as competence in the areas of training and communications. It has a staff of 140 who offer service to over 2,000 school districts and 97 service regions. With such a large number of districts to serve, SERN's thrust has been to focus on major needs and train local personnel as trainers who go back to their local level and provide inservice. SERN's worth is considered valuable by the schools and service regions; furthermore, research supports the philosophy that staff development is more effective from the "inside" (Falik & Sichel, 1972). "Inside [p. 190]" refers to inservice given by personnel employed within the district who supposedly are familiar with the district's needs. SERN's on-going consultation and inservicing done at the schools appear to have the greatest effect on staff development and program improvement.

The concept of a consulting teacher in special education is not new, and roles of consulting teachers are somewhat similar to roles of resource teachers (Dunn, 1963; Meyen, 1968). However, the roles differ in that the consulting teachers have no direct classroom responsibilities. That is, they do not bring a handicapped child into their classrooms for diagnosis and educational programming and then return him/her to his/her original classroom with diagnosis and appropriate techniques and materials to assist the child's original teacher. Diagnosis and

remediation procedures are undertaken by the child's teacher in his/her own classroom. In short, the consulting teacher assists the teacher in the diagnosis and remedial procedures. With this idea in mind, the Master Plan addressed the need for on-going consultation and in-house inservice by creating the program specialist's position.

The Program Specialist's Position in the California Master Plan for Special Education

Along with the Resource Specialist Program and SERN, the California Master Plan mandated another position, the program specialist, which was designed to meet the call for staff and program development and in-house inservice, as well as a number of other areas of service. The position is defined as a pupil personnel employee with general responsibilities which have been previously listed in Chapter 1.

Research available on the program specialist is quite limited compared to other mandated positions, such as the Resource Specialist (Reynolds, 1973; Meyen, 1968; Cruickshank & Johnson, 1975) or Special Education Administrator (Dunn, 1968; Turnbull, 1977). Smith (1980) reported that early in 1977, the directors of the 10 funded Responsible Local Agencies (RLAs, now called SELPAs) decided that there was a need for a more specific definition of the role and function of a program specialist. Each RLA had implemented the position in compliance with A.B. 4040, but among the 10 RLAs the implemented roles were not similar. The directors selected one program specialist to be chairperson of a role clarification group composed of one representative program specialist from each RLA. Therefore, one joint committee served all of

the RLAs.

The roles clarification group met four times. It was agreed that the final product of the group would be a written document. This document was presented to the program specialists at the California Association for Program Specialists (CAPS) Conference in June, 1977. The role, function, training, and experience were delineated in a five-page report which SELPAs were encouraged to use in composing their own job description for the program specialist.

At the April, 1979, meeting of CAPS, Sue Grossman, President, presented a paper, Role and Function: A Time Study. The study was statewide and showed the major categories of the program specialist's job which were divided by allocation of time spent. Findings from the survey of 37 respondents gave demographic information showing the mean response for the items shown in Table 2.1. The information stated that approximately 44 special day classes, resource specialists programs, schools, and/or districts were served weekly by program specialists. Other statistics provided information about the average number of students served indirectly (425.5), number of hours (8+) and days (193.4) worked, and salary ($105.33/day). Further interpretation stated that program specialists spent 66 percent of their time providing direct service to either students or teaching staff (Grossman, 1979).

Table 2.1

Survey of Program Specialist Demographics

n = 37	$\bar{x}$
No. of Special Day Classes Served	11.4
No. of Resource Specialists Served	9.6
No. of Schools Served	18.0
No. of Districts Served	5.0
No. of Miles Driven/Month	685.5
No. of Special Education Students Served	425.2
No. of Days Worked/Year	193.4
No. of Hours Worked/Day	8+
Salary/Year	$20,256.51
Salary/Day	$ 105.33

$\bar{x}$ = mean

(Grossman, 1979)

The program specialist's position was evaluated officially by the State Department of Education via the Independent Evaluation of the California Master Plan for Special Education, completed by The Stanford Research Institute (SRI) in 1980. The purpose of the investigation was to determine how special education programs were being implemented in districts, RLAs, and counties. Most of the information presented was based on findings from questionnaires sent to more than 6,000 special education and regular education teachers and to more than 3,000 parents of students who were receiving special education services during the 1978-79 school year. All the Master Plan (MP) areas implementing the program during the 1978-79 school year were included in the sample (17 RLAs), as was a sample of eight nonparticipating service regions that were selected for their similarity to the RLAs already in the Master Plan. The characteristics used to match the non-Master Plan (NMP) group with the MP group were: size of the student population, region of the state, total dollars spent per student, and the urban-rural nature of the district. Findings were presented for the following four major topic areas: personnel preparation, assessment and placement, program services and effects, and parent knowledge, participation, and satisfaction.

The areas of personnel preparation and program services are of particular importance to this study, because these areas appear to be major responsibilities assigned to program specialists. These reports are displayed in Appendices F and G. This information provides current research and the first formal evaluation of the program specialist.

SRI stated that a conflict existed over the role of the program specialist. It was reported that the program specialist performed an administrative function of program coordination across the entire special education area; the program specialist worked with the resource specialist but had no direct role in working with students. At the elementary level, 29 to 38 percent of the Master Plan teachers reported they had used the program specialist, whereas 30 to 42 percent indicated that the program specialist was not needed. The use decreased at the secondary level, and the indication that the program specialist for the secondary level was not needed increased. During the site visits to one RLA, SRI found directly opposite views from administrators. Some favored the position and others felt it was not needed.

The RLA director of an urban/suburban Master Plan II area (that implemented Master Plan in 1976-77) stated that program specialist management positions, with limited supervisory responsibilities, were good; they provided support services and improved the staff and line functions of the administrative model. In a suburban unit, however, opinions conflicted about whether more program specialists were needed and whether any were needed at all. Respondents in other areas reported problems with program specialists. District special education personnel in a county unit believed that county program specialists were unnecessary because they duplicated district resources. In another suburban unit, both the county and district employed program specialists, which caused confusion and duplicated services.

The assistant superintendent in a rural area reported that program

specialists had become junior administrators. Instead of providing support services to school personnel, they spent most of their time performing administrative functions at the county administrative level, such as budgeting, classified personnel supervision, and transportation. A district superintendent in that area also questioned whether program specialists served students or "pushed papers [Stanford Research Institute, 1980, p. 124]."

Respondents in Non-Master Plan areas also commented on the role and benefits or necessity of the program specialist. In an urban/suburban area, the program coordinators were scheduled to become program specialists under Master Plan. The program coordinators did not want these to be teaching positions because that would be a demotion from their administrative positions. The county special education director of a suburban unit hypothesized that program specialists and resource specialists would have problems in defining the intent of their roles and the types of support services each should provide to teachers. Respondents in the Non-Master Plan areas also stated that filling vacancies with qualified people, especially competent teachers who also met the credential requirements, would be difficult. This might have involved the release of some of the Non-Master Plan areas' teachers who may have not had the requirements. The hiring practices in one urban/suburban area reportedly precluded the firing of personnel who would not be able to fill the new Master Plan roles adequately (Stanford Research Institute, 1980). Because of these problems, the role and function of the program specialist were an issue that SRI

planned to explore in greater depth during the 1980-81 evaluation.

In addition to the SRI study, the University of California, Santa Barbara conducted a study supported by a grant from the California Office of Special Education. This investigation was designed in part to generate information to clarify actual functioning of the program specialist compared to intended roles described in the law.

Although the final report is not yet available, a summary of the major findings has been released (Campbell, 1981). The study intended to identify the role requirements for program specialists as described in Education Code Sections 56333 and other existing analyses (e.g., Personnel Development Committee report on program specialists, Auditor General's Office report on financing and administering programs for special education, and California State Department of Education review of special education). These requirements for functioning were analyzed in six areas necessary for delivery of services to individuals with exceptional needs (referral, assessment, planning, placement, instruction, and review). The study proposed to translate these requirements into idealized roles for functioning in terms of direct and indirect (support) services to other professionals, parents, and children.

Findings reported by Campbell which have relevance to this study are reported as follows:

Role Demographics

> Nearly half of the program specialists have no supervisory responsibility. Of those who do supervise others, the largest percentage report responsibility for special class teachers

(29 percent), resource specialists (26 percent) and instructional aides (20 percent).

Over half (52 percent) of the program specialists work more than 40 hours/per week on the job.

Nearly half (43 percent) of the program specialists work on a teaching salary schedule, with 38 percent on an administrative salary schedule. None of the specialists makes less than $15,000 per year; 45 percent are in the $25,000-30,000 salary range.

Training and Experience

Program specialists hold a variety of regular and special education credentials including: elementary credential (37 percent), secondary (13 percent), administration/supervision (33 percent), Pupil Personnel Services (10 percent), Learning Handicapped (37 percent), Communicatively Handicapped (5 percent), Severely Handicapped (14 percent), Physically Handicapped (2 percent).

Over a third of the program specialists (39 percent) hold a master's degree; five percent have a doctorate.

Nearly half (49 percent) of the specialists have experience as a special education teacher, 21 percent have taught in regular education programs.

In general, program specialists feel they have received either formal training or job related experience which provided them with the skills they need for their job.

Role Functioning

Nearly half (43 percent) of the program specialists believe they have major responsibility for the overall management of a student's case from referral through placement and review of progress.

While more than half (55 percent) of the specialists have major responsibility for coordination, consultation, and/or program development in the LH area, many fewer have major responsibility for CH (19 percent), PH (10 percent), and SH (18 percent) programs. About half have at least some responsibility in career-vocational (53 percent) and pre-school handicapped (44 percent) areas.

A majority of program specialists report having daily contact with handicapped students (53 percent), and special class teachers

(67 percent). About half have daily contact with resource specialists (49 percent) and special education administrators (42 percent).

Very few specialists work with handicapped students either one at a time (1 percent) or in small groups (2 percent).

Program specialists have contact with an average of 31 handicapped students, six resource specialists, seven parents, six Designated Instructional Service instructors, five principals, four regular teachers, six school psychologists, and eight special class teachers during a typical week.

Over the course of the school year, program specialists spend most of their time in placement, student review, instructional planning and staff development activities. About half spend less than 5 percent of their time on assessment or program development, or on program review. Thirty-one percent spend no time in instruction; 41 percent spend no time in research.

Ninety percent of program specialists engage in developing IEPs 1-2 days per week.

Routine activities such as completing forms, writing reports, travel and telephone communications occur very frequently as part of program specialists' work.

Over half of the program specialists feel they should be spending more time in on-going consultation with teachers (56 percent), in modifying regular education programs for ineligible students (15 percent), in working with other personnel to develop and implement programs (71 percent), and in research activities (51 percent).

Program specialists view their role and responsibilities as distinctly different from most other personnel. School psychologists and special education administrators are the individuals with whom there is the most perceived overlap, and with whom program specialists perceive role conflict.

School Personnel Views on Work of Program Specialists (School personnel include elementary teachers, special education teachers, DIS personnel, instructional aides, school psychologists, principals, and special education administrators).

In general, a larger percentage of professionals are unfamiliar with the work of program specialists than with resource specialists' work.

Program specialists are viewed as having at least some responsibility in all service delivery areas. The areas where program specialists are most frequently seen as having major to full responsibility are placement (43 percent) and review (32 percent).

Twenty-seven percent of the school personnel perceive program specialists as having major to full responsibility for the overall management of a student's case.

Program specialists are viewed as having responsibilities which overlap with most other school personnel. The most frequently identified overlap is with special education administrators (44 percent) and resource specialists (38 percent).

Perceived overlapping responsibilities do not seem to relate to major role conflict. For program specialists there is "some" perceived conflict with resource specialists (28 percent), special education administrators (26 percent) and school psychologists (25 percent) [p. 4, 1981].

Effectiveness/Satisfaction

In general, program specialists are perceived as being effective in providing needed services.

Over half of the school personnel feel that program specialists provide leadership, and effectively coordinate the program for which they are responsible. Program specialists are seen as providing useful input in the development of IEPs, and as playing a beneficial role in providing appropriate educational services to handicapped students. Program specialists are viewed as most effective with resource specialists (42 percent), special class teachers (41 percent) and handicapped students (41 percent).

Criticism of program specialists include: efficiency of services, not enough time spent evaluating effectiveness of programs for handicapped students, and not enough inservice provided to keep staff updated on educational changes. Nineteen percent of the school personnel view program specialists as not effective with regular classroom teachers.

Sixty-one percent of the school personnel think that program specialists should be advocates for the educational rights of handicapped students.

Sixty-three percent of the school personnel are personally satisfied with program specialists' services, and 50 percent think program specialists are needed for the successful implementation of the Master Plan [Campbell, 1981, p. 5].

Campbell's findings could offer information that would serve to answer in part some of the questions involved in this study if the status of program specialists and special education was the same at present as when her study was conducted in 1978. However, the status has changed markedly. For example, Campbell surveyed all the Master Plan Service Regions at that time, which were 21. This number has grown to 97 at present. In addition, approximately 55 program specialists were surveyed by Campbell and it is estimated that the number is well over 300 today (CAPS, 1982).

Along with the changes in numbers and growth, the law has changed. The adjustment of the number of special education students per program specialist, which was 560 and is now 850 (Senate Bill 769, 1981), has affected the program specialist's role. Legislative hearings are presently reviewing the Master Plan mandate for program specialists and may make more changes. It appears that the status of special education and also the program specialist is subject to change.

Development of a Job Description

A well-written, up-to-date job description gives organizations a key tool in planning human resource requirements and in using human resources properly. Because departments and units, and the jobs within them, are like living organisms--they expand; they contract; they move up, down, and sideways; sometimes they merge. One must be aware that this job description does not always describe what the job entails. Although job descriptions are not etched in stone once and for all time, they are quite important for the individual and his organization.

Furthermore, the continuing emphasis on complying with such federal legislation, such as the Equal Pay Act and the Equal Employment Opportunity Act, makes job descriptions more important than ever before. They are, for example, critical documents in any dispute over qualifications required for specific jobs, and equal pay for equal work.

Watson (1975) defined the job description as the end product of a job analysis. It is a written record of the job and its requirements that typically consists of the following segments:

1. The job title, department, section, and other identifying data to distinguish it from all other jobs.
2. A summary or capsule statement of the work performed and the scope and overall purpose of the job, which also helps to add perspective to the individual duties.
3. The individual duties, assignments, and tasks which make up the job.
4. The job specifications which bring out the requirements and demands made on the incumbent in terms of the evaluation factors.

Job descriptions are commonly written in a telegraphic or abbreviated style, avoiding verbiage, to get directly at what the incumbent does. Where significant, the guidance provided and the level of skill involved in the tasks are also characterized. The description follows the natural flow of work if the job consists of sequential operations. If the duties are unrelated, they may be grouped in order of their importance, the time spent on them, or the frequency of their performance.

Henderson (1976), in describing the makeup of a job description, stated that although there was no universal description form, a complete job description should contain the following sections: job identification, job summary, job duties (including descriptions of any dangerous, dirty, or uncomfortable assignments), accountabilities, and job specification. (If there is no job specification section, there should be an employment standards section to follow the job duties section.) A format commonly followed in job descriptions is to place the job identification, job summary, job duties, and accountabilities sections on one side of the page, with the job specification section on the other. Henderson went on to clarify these sections:

Job Identification. This section contains such information as job title, status (exempt or nonexempt), job code (if any), date written or revised, location of job by plan/division, department/section, title of immediate superior, grade/level and points (if used in the evaluation process), pay range, signature of the person writing the description, and signature of the person approving it.

Job Summary. This section is a brief narrative picture of the job that highlights its general characteristics and the role the job holder follows in the organization. In a few, carefully-selected and presented words, it indicates clearly and specifically what the job holder must do on his or her job. It provides sufficient information to identify the major functions and activities of the job and differentiates them from those of other jobs. This section is especially valuable for a quick overview of the job.

Job Duties. Duty statements describe activities that must be accomplished in the performance of the job and for which specific accountabilities can be set. Normally, measures of performance can be applied to these duty statements, and they can be used as a basis for setting the primary goals of the job.

This section represents a summary, usually in outline form. It is not meant to be all-inclusive, but rather to describe duties related to major performance requirements. Normally, one sentence may describe each major duty or responsibility. In developing this section, the writer must avoid doing a task analysis or breakdown. This area contains major duties and responsibilities, not the tasks necessary for their performance.

Accountabilities. This section briefly describes the major end results achieved when job duties are performed satisfactorily. It serves as a guide in setting performance goals and standards; it is useful as a reference in preparing performance appraisals.

Job Specification. This important section describes the human qualities necessary to perform the job. It gives a rundown on compensable factors selected by the organization to determine the worth and value of the job. Compensable factors are those that identify qualities common to many jobs. Although various compensable factors have been used by various organizations, some of the more common factors are knowledge, skill, responsibility, working conditions, effort, physical requirements, problem solving, know-how, decision making. This section also describes the degree of quality required for the

particular job under consideration. This factor analysis of the job provides the basic data for evaluating it and comparing it with other jobs.

Properly developed, the job specification serves as employment standards for the job. The organization that does not use an evaluation system based on compensable factors must develop an employment standards section that accurately describes the necessary knowledge and the physical and emotional requirements demanded of the incumbent. The job specification or employment standards section is extremely important--not only because it prescribes the standards for selection and promotion, but also because it regulates the pay of the job. The rise of affirmative action programs mandates that the qualifications specified be bona fide occupational qualifications and that there be a demonstrated relationship between qualifications and job.

Differentiating Between Job and Position Description

In discussing job descriptions, it is necessary to note that some companies distinguish between job descriptions and position descriptions. The U.S. Department of Labor defined position and job as:

> Position: a collection of tasks constituting the total work assignments of a single worker. There are as many positions as there are workers in the organization.
>
> Job: a group of positions that are identical with respect to their major or significant tasks and are sufficiently alike to justify their being covered by a single analysis. There may be one or more persons employed in the same job [Factor Evaluation System, 1979, p. 29].

Organizations that differentiate between job descriptions and position descriptions usually do so for upper and middle management,

and professionals. In making such differentiations, organizations usually assume that it is more difficult to describe positions precisely (Henderson, 1976). Thus, they require a more general narrative form for describing positions than for describing jobs. It is felt, however, that such a separation is unnecessary. If one takes the viewpoint that all members of an organization are responsible to some extent for planning their own work activities, solving problems, and making decisions connected with their jobs, there is no need to differentiate between job and position descriptions (Factor Evaluation, 1979). The same format and procudures apply to the most senior job in the organization and to the lowest as well.

Job analysis is the first step toward written or rewritten job descriptions. The analysis of a job involves a detailed description of its duties and responsibilities, its relationship to technology and other jobs, the knowledge and other employment standards necessary to perform it, and accountabilities and other-job-holder requirements. Henderson (1976) and Watson (1975) suggested that there are five methods for gathering, analyzing, and recording such job information: (1) interviews with the workers (or groups of workers) performing the job or with the manager supervising them; (2) observation of the jobs being performed; (3) completion of a questionnaire by each worker performing a job or by the manager supervising them; (4) completion by employees of logs or diaries, with entries for each task done over a period of time; or (5) any combination of these. As stated earlier, the job descriptions for the program specialists display variety in all

of the specified sections by Watson and/or Henderson. Many of the job descriptions viewed in the pilot study more closely resembled position descriptions as defined by the U.S. Department of Labor (Factor Evaluation System, 1979), than the standard job descriptions that applies to a job held by a number of people, all of whom have the same duties. Position descriptions pertain more to a job that is flexible and accommodative to the needs of the organization which may be affected by variables uncommon to other organizations. The Factor Evaluation System (1979) equates "position" with "role" and utilizes the position description as the instrument for evaluation of that position. It seems to follow that after clarification of the job, position, role, etc., an evaluation procedure or criteria should follow.

Evaluation of the Role of the Program Specialist

Harris, McIntyre and Littleton (1979) said there are three approaches to the evaluation of personnel: (1) the characteristics of the individual, sometimes called "presage criteria," (2) the products attributed to the individual, and (3) the processes used by the individual. Such a procedure or theory ascribes to an on-the-job type of evaluation, i.e., the job or position has already been developed and titled. However, this theory can still be utilized in analyzing the worth of a position/role and perhaps clarify major functions.

Characteristics of the individual might be such relatively easy-to-measure qualities as knowledge of the subject or accepted professional practices, grade-point averages, college hours or degrees held, and years of professional experience. Some of these items, such as grade-point averages and knowledge, may be legitimate considerations at

the time of initial employment but perhaps inappropriate for evaluation purposes.

Evaluating performance in terms of characteristics of the performer makes an assumption that there is a reasonably high correlation between those characteristics and effectiveness, however effectiveness is defined. Harris et al., (1979) stated that this assumption has not been supported by research and does not recommend that personnel evaluation be geared to characteristics of the evaluatee.

Evaluation of personnel based on a product has appeal. However, products in education are hard to measure. Furthermore, the more important and complex the product, the harder it tends to be to measure. For example, it is relatively simple to measure students' knowledge of information, but how well can thirst for knowledge that endures beyond schooling be measured?

Also, even if valid measures of important learnings did exist, ways of ascribing outcomes to individual teachers would need to be found, not to mention the problem of evaluating the contributions of individual administrators, supervisors, and others to those outcomes. Who would say that the measured learnings of third-graders are not influenced by teachers in previous years? Who would say that measured learnings of students in a high school course are not affected by concurrent as well as previous learnings in other high school courses?

Influences that are external to the school, such as native ability, home environment, peer relationships, and past and current advantages or disadvantages, are highly influential and affect student learning products. Therefore, even the most successful teacher's efforts could be futile against such outside forces.

The processes used by the individual must ultimately be validated against products. Therefore, when evaluating for the purpose of improving performance, it appears best handled through process as far as the evaluatee's performance is concerned (Harris et al., 1979). Bolton (1973) believed that superior products result from well-designed and organized programs with systematic procedures and well-defined responsibilities. He felt that process and products tend to interact and that evaluation for the purpose of improving performance must focus on the process.

Along with evaluating personnel performance, personnel evaluation can also serve to clarify a particular role in the organization as well as delineate the role's responsibilities. In order to evaluate a position, educators must consider the organization's desired outcome and the role such a position must play in reaching that outcome. Watson (1975) described this process as "a method of organizing peoples' judgment so that all jobs are examined on the same basis and with the same considerations [p. 29]." He further defined "job evaluation" as

> The complete operation of determining the value of an individual job in an organization in relation to the other jobs in the organization. It begins with job analysis to obtain job descriptions and includes relating the descriptions by some system designed to determine the relative value of the jobs or group of jobs [p. 29].

The evaluation method chosen in this study followed the process theory discussed by Harris and Bolton in that the process of the program specialist's service delivery was examined. The procedure for this study examines the service delivery of the program specialist and

closely resembed the job evaluation procedures mentioned by Watson (1975). This procedure is explained in Chapter 3.

Summary

The investigation has reviewed the prevalent philosophies and significant contributions which influenced the field of education in the area of personnel. A history of the personnel emphasis in California prior to Master Plan was reviewed also. With an increasing emphasis on specialization and a need for more trained special education personnel, the pre-Master Plan period was a time for establishing and prioritizing needs. Following the pre-Master Plan era, an indepth view of California's Master Plan was presented and its influence on personnel staffing patterns and staff development programs was discussed.

Following the Master Plan discussion, the literature on the program specialist's position was reported. Recent findings on the program specialist's role indicated ambiguity and confusion in the role. Evaluation of personnel and a discussion of the development of a job description which are pertinent to this study were reviewed also.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the methodology and procedures used in the study. The chapter is divided into the following sections: (a) description of the population that was surveyed; (b) description of the survey instruments; (c) procedures for the data collection; (d) treatment of the data; and (e) products of the study.

Description of the Population

Because the number and size of service regions continue to grow and fluctuate, all 97 of the California SELPAs listed with the State Department of Education as of January, 1982 were surveyed. A SELPA might be an entire county, a single school district, or a consortium of more than one district and/or county. SELPAs also differ in the periods of time that they have been a Master Plan Service Region, some as long as six years while others as little as six months. Therefore, the subgroups of the study focused on the variables of size and longevity. The criterion for the groupings was based on the geographic square miles of each SELPA and the California Basic Education Data System (CBEDS) provided by the State Department of Education. The subgroups were divided as follows:

1) large SELPAs (geographically), 2500+ square miles

2) large SELPAs (ADA), 6000+ Individuals with Exceptional Needs (IWENS)

3) medium SELPAs (geographically), 801-2500 square miles

4) medium SELPAs (ADA), 2001-6000 IWENs

5) small SELPAs (geographically), 0-800 square miles

6) small SELPAs (ADA), 0-2,000 IWENs

7) high longevity (more than 3 years)

8) medium longevity (2-3 years)

9) low longevity (1 year)

Individuals selected to provide the data from each SELPA were its director and one program specialist designated by the director as the Participating Program Specialist (PPS).

Table 3.1

Numbers of SELPAs Sampled, Categorized by ADA, Geographic Size, and Longevity

ADA	Geographic Size		Longevity		
			Low	Medium	High
LARGE (N=21)	Large	(N=4)	2	2	0
	Medium	(N=9)	4	3	2
	Small	(N=8)	3	4	1
		Total	9	9	3
MEDIUM (N=31)	Large	(N=8)	3	3	2
	Medium	(N=5)	0	1	4
	Small	(N=18)	11	4	3
		Total	14	8	9
SMALL (N=29)	Large	(N=5)	1	3	0
	Medium	(N=13)	12	1	0
	Small	(N=11)	5	6	1
		Total	18	10	1

Description of the Survey Instruments

The SELPA Directors' Survey/Questionnaire (Appendix A) and the Primary Responsibilities Survey (Appendix B) were developed specifically for this study and refined with the assistance of experts in the field. The procedure for refinement is described in the validation section of this chapter. In its final form, the SELPA Directors' Survey/Questionnaire contained a memo which explained the purpose of the study and requested that the Director complete the attached questionnaire. Demographic information, such as geographic square miles, the ADA of the SELPA, and the number of years the SELPA has employed program specialists (longevity) was requested along with the Director's evaluation of the importance of the program specialist's position. The Directors were asked to rate the program specialist on a five point scale in seven areas. Those areas were: (1) meeting compliance, (2) coordination, (3) communication, (4) effectiveness, (5) efficiency, (6) expertise, and (7) support, each of which is defined on the questionnaire as well as in the previous definition of terms section.

The Directors' Survey was designed to provide data that would answer the question of importance of the program specialist to the SELPA's delivery of service. At the same time, the SELPA Directors' Survey asked for demographic information needed for the variables of size, ADA, and longevity. This information addressed the question of what effect these variables have on the program specialist's position.

In addition to the three inclusions in the SELPA Directors' Survey/Questionnaire, the memo also informed each director of the study's

additional survey which would require the input of a program specialist to validate his/her primary responsibilities. Entitled the Primary Responsibilities of the Program Specialist's Survey (Primary Responsibilities Survey), this instrument was designed by utilizing the SELPAs' program specialist job descriptions (Appendix B). The assigned responsibilities on each job description were extracted and listed concisely on the survey form. Additional columns entitled Actual Responsibilities and Primary Responsibilities were included also. Directions requested the Participating Program Specialist (PPS) to examine the list of assigned responsibilities and check those for which he/she was responsible. Following this, the PPS was asked to go back to those responsibilities which he/she checked and identify which of those were primary responsibilities by selecting and ranking the five most primary responsibilities. To assist the PPS in this process, primary responsibilities were defined on the survey.

The Primary Responsibilities Survey was designed to address the question of what are the primary responsibilities of the program specialist. These additional data were necessary for defining the program specialist's role.

Procedure for Data Collection

The SELPA Directors' Survey/Questionnaire, the Primary Responsibilities Survey, and a memo were mailed to each director of the 97 SELPAs. A self-addressed stamped envelope accompanied each questionnaire and survey to encourage a higher return rate. A follow-up telephone call, approximately two weeks later, was made to those directors

and/or program specialists who did not respond by the requested date in an effort to be sure he/she had received the questionnaire and to encourage his/her response.

Table 3.2 displays the sequence of data collection activities in the month each took place. Data collection was completed by the end of April, 1982.

Table 3.2

Data Collection Timeline

Date	Activity
January	Validation of instruments by experts in the field
February	Test-retest reliability of instruments with 30 SELPAs
	Reliability coefficient computed on data at .30 or higher
March	Instruments sent to the remaining 67 SELPAs
April	Follow-up phone calls to non-respondents
	All data collected by April 25th

Treatment of the Data

The items in the survey/questionnaire reflected the purpose of the study and were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Frequency distributions were constructed for each item response of the SELPA Directors' Survey to indicate the importance of each item. To determine the importance, each Directors' Survey yielded a program specialist's importance rating. This was computed by using the numerical value

assigned to each of the rankings of importance. They were:

a) Not important = 1, b) Somewhat important = 2, c) Important = 3, d) Very important = 4, and e) Extremely important = 5. The rankings for items one through seven on all surveys were summed. This sum was then totaled for the sample and divided by 81 (n of sample) to yield the mean survey sum. The mean survey sum was divided by 7 (n of areas of importance) to yield a Composite Rating of Program Specialists' Importance (CRPSI).

SELPAs were categorized according to the variables of size, ADA, and program specialist's longevity by utilizing frequency distributions. The measures of the relationships between program specialist importance and the variables were then calculated.

The data from the Primary Responsibilities Survey was used in tabulating frequency distributions for the actual and primary responsibilities indicated on each survey and served in efforts to define a generalized role of the program specialist. To qualify as a component, a job responsibility was to be considered primary if indicated so by at least 50 percent of the respondents. This is an arbitrary percentage because it is not certain how the data will cluster. In order to define the primary responsibilities further, respondents were asked to select their five primary responsibilities and rank them with number one being the most primary.

Validation and Reliability of the Instruments

The instruments were submitted to a panel of special education authorities for content validation. The panel consisted of two SELPA Directors and two professors of Special Education (Appendix D). A

majority consensus of panel members was required for satisfactory validation. Panel members were mailed the instruments and a letter (Appendix E) which asked them to evaluate the instruments and rate them as satisfactory or in need of improvement. Recommendations were also requested, but no modifications were needed.

To establish reliability of the instruments, a pilot study was conducted among 30 randomly selected SELPAs and a test-retest procedure employed. The SELPA Directors and one program specialist for each of the 30 SELPAs were mailed the survey/questionnaires and then requested to respond to the same survey/questionnaires three weeks later. Twenty-eight SELPA Directors and a program specialist from each of the 28 SELPAs responded. These same 28 responses were utilized in the total sample because the procedures remained the same. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavich, 1972) was computed. A coefficient of .30 was considered the lowest acceptable value for determining item reliability. The coefficient of .30 was chosen because due to the high response rate, it is considered statistically significant.

Table 3.3 displays the ranges of the reliability coefficient for Pre-Post administrations of the Directors' Survey and Program Specialist Survey.

Products of the Study

Results from the SELPA Directors' Survey/Questionnaires yielded a Composite Rating of Program Specialists' Importance (CRPSI) for the

Table 3.3

Pre-Post Administrations of the Directors' Survey and Program Specialists' Survey

Directors' Survey	Range r	Significance p
Items No. 1-7	.93-1.0	.001
Program Specialists' Survey		
Items No. 1-13 (Consultation)	.35-1.0	.003
Items No. 14-18 (Coordination)	.69-1.0	.001
Items No. 19-26 (Communication)	.66-1.0	.001
Items No. 27-34 (Staff & Program Development)	.46-1.0	.003
Items No. 35-43 (Support)	.69-1.0	.001
Items No. 44-48 (Compliance)	.80-1.0	.001
Items No. 49-53 (Management)	.77-1.0	.001
Items No. 54-60 (Supervisory)	.71-1.0	.001
Items No. 61-65 (Evaluation)	.80-1.0	.001

sampled SELPAs as well as for each subgroup. In addition, those areas which the program specialist was rated as most important were tabulated.

Along with the CRPSI, a Synthesis of the Program Specialists' Primary Responsibilities (SPR) was produced from viewing the frequency distributions and tabulating the most frequent responses. A synthesis was also completed for each subgroup and an SPR tabulated. From the SPR, a role description was generated following guidelines for writing position descriptions (Factor Evaluation System, 1978). This role and position description, entitled A Consensus Model of the Program Specialist's Role and Position Description, were products generated from this study and served as a current and consensual role description. It was possible that subgroups could utilize consistently the program specialist in different roles than was indicated in the general SPR and any such differences were reported.

The data for the additional variable of program specialist longevity, collected in the first survey, were assigned to one of three groups (Table 3.1) and a frequency distribution was computed. Differences in program specialists' roles according to their longevity were reported in Table 4.4.

The procedures outlined in this chapter were intended to ensure an orderly approach to the gathering, compilation, and presentation of the data needed to complete this investigation. The findings of the study are presented in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

It was the purpose of this study to investigate the role and importance of the program specialist's position in California in order to determine the primary responsibilities of the position and its effect on the operation of the SELPA. Relationships among variables such as ADA, geographic size and program specialist longevity were also investigated. Tables 4.1 through 4.4 summarize the data derived from the two survey instruments.

All 97 SELPAs in California were sent surveys for the project. The 61 responding SELPAs were composed of 28 SELPAs which responded to the pilot study as well as 33 other SELPAs. Since the instruments and data gathering procedure remained the same for the total sample, the data collected on the first administration of the instruments in the pilot study were utilized in the total sample. Out of the 97 SELPAs surveyed, 61 responded by the requested date. Follow-up phone calls requesting a response of the remaining 36 produced an additional 20 responses. This brought the total response to 81 respondents, an 83 percent return rate, which was considered satisfactory.

Analysis of the Directors' Survey

The Directors' Survey was designed to evaluate the program specialist's importance to the operation of the SELPA based on seven areas of importance (Appendix A). The directors were asked to rate their program specialists in the seven areas on a scale of 1 to 5 which

ranged from "not important" = 1 to "extremely important" = 5. Table 4.1 reports the respondents' evaluation of the program specialists' importance to the SELPAs' operation. The areas of "Communication" and "Support" were rated as very important by a majority (68-69%) of the directors. The next highest areas were those of "Effectiveness" and "Expertise" which were rated as extremely important by 57 percent of the directors.

Table 4.1 also displays the tabulation of the Composite Rating of Program Specialists' Importance (CRPSI) as perceived by the directors of 81 SELPAs. The rank of 4.2, interpreted as "very important," was the computed CRPSI for the composite of seven areas by the directors of 81 California SELPAs. A CRPSI rating was also computed for each of the seven areas yielding a range of 3.9 - 4.5.

Table 4.1

Summary of the Program Specialists' Importance to the SELPA Operation

Areas of Importance	n	1 Not Important		2 Somewhat Important		3 Important		4 Very Important		5 Extremely Important		CRPSI** $\bar{X}$
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1. Meeting Compliance	81	5	7	3	4	18	22	26	32	29	36	3.9
2. Coordination*	81	1	1	6	8	11	14	26	32	37	46	4.3
3. Communication*	81	5	7	0	0	9	11	12	14	55	68	4.4
4. Effectiveness	81	5	7	4	5	11	14	15	18	46	57	4.1
5. Efficiency	81	5	7	4	5	9	11	23	28	40	50	4.1
6. Expertise*	81	5	7	0	0	3	4	27	33	46	57	4.3
7. Support*	81	0	0	5	7	3	4	17	21	56	69	4.5

* Area rated as most important

Composite Total 4.2***

** Composite Rating of Program Specialists' Importance

*** Scale Interpretation

1 = Not Important : < 1.5
2 = Somewhat Important : 1.5 - 2.49
3 = Important : 2.5 - 3.49
4 = Very Important : 3.5 - 4.49
5 = Extremely Important: $\geq$ 4.5

Table 4.2 displays the CRPSI as it is related to the variables of ADA, geographic size, and longevity. The variable of small ADA and small geographic size produced the somewhat lower CRPSI ratings of 3.7 and 3.4. The variables of large ADA and small geographic size produced the highest rating of 4.7. The variable of one year in longevity produced a lower CRPSI of 3.7 and the variable of medium longevity produced the highest longevity CRPSI of 4.2.

Table 4.2

CRPSI Categorized by Variable Groupings of ADA, Geographic Size and Longevity

SELPA Description	n	%	CRPSI* Rating
Large ADA	21	26	4.4**
Small Geographic Size	8	10	4.7
Medium Geographic Size	9	11	4.6
Large Geographic Size	4	5	3.9
Medium ADA	31	38	4.5
Small Geographic Size	18	22	4.5
Medium Geographic Size	5	6	4.6
Large Geographic Size	8	10	4.4
Small ADA	29	36	3.7
Small Geographic Size	11	13	3.4
Medium Geographic Size	13	16	4.0
Large Geographic Size	5	6	3.9
Low Longevity (1 yr.)	41	51	3.7
Medium Longevity (2-3 yrs.)	27	33	4.2
High Longevity (3+ yrs.)	13	16	4.0
Composite Sample	81		4.2

* CRPSI = Composite Rating of Program Specialists' Importance

** Scale Interpretation

1 = Not Important	:	< 1.5
2 = Somewhat Important	:	1.5 - 2.49
3 = Important	:	2.5 - 3.49
4 = Very Important	:	3.5 - 4.49
5 = Extremely Important	:	$\geq$ 4.5

Summary of the Program Specialists' Primary Responsibilities Survey (The Primary Responsibilities Survey)

The Primary Responsibilities Survey was designed to validate the actual and primary responsibilities assigned to program specialists as perceived by program specialists. Eighty-one program specialists (83%) responded to the survey and a tabulation of their responses is recorded in Appendix H. Sixty-five responsibilities listed under nine categories were displayed in this summary. Listed also are the frequencies and percentages of program specialists who indicated each responsibility was an actual responsibility of his/her job as well as which responsibilities were considered primary. Of those responsibilities indicated as primary, an additional section in the summary displayed a ranking of the primary responsibilities from most to least primary. This summary table was a necessary procedure to derive a synthesis of the primary responsibilities discussed in the next section.

Synthesis of the Program Specialists' Primary Responsibilities (SPR)

In addition to reporting the responses of the Participating Program Specialist (PPS), a synthesis was completed of the primary responsibilities as indicated by the PPSs. Table 4.3 displays those responsibilities which were designated as primary by the respondents. The original criterion for qualifying as a synthesized primary responsibility was 50 percent or higher agreement by the PPS. Fifty percent was an arbitrary selection because it was uncertain how the data would cluster. The data did indeed cluster, but at a somewhat lower percentage. Those areas considered most primary were the

responsibilities which reported the highest percentage of agreement by the respondents. An additional cluster of five responsibilities which was agreed upon as primary by roughly 20 percent of the respondents was listed as secondary responsibilities. The responsibility of "Consulting with Teachers" was indicated as primary by 74 percent of the respondents. "Planning and/or participating in each school's staff and program development" was a primary responsibility for 51 percent of the PPSs.

Table 4.3

Synthesis of the Program Specialists' Primary Responsibilities (SPR)

(N = 81)

	Specified as Primary	
Primary Responsibilities	f	%
1. Consult with teachers	60	74
2. Plan and/or participate in each school's staff and program development	41	51
3. Provide assistance to assure that pupils have full educational opportunity	32	40
4. Assist in coordinating special programs between and among districts	28	35
Secondary Responsibilities	f	%
5. Coordinate the development of IEP for students with parents and staff	21	26
6. Present inservice/workshops in areas of expertise upon request	19	23
7. Monitor the implementation and evaluation of the IEP program	18	22
8. Review program/pupil progress and recommend program revisions when appropriate/directed	16	20
9. Develop a record-keeping system which will track all services and mandated follow-up. Maintain case records on referred students as appropriate	16	20

Table 4.4 displays the Synthesis of the Program Specialists' Responsibilities (SPR) for the variable groupings of ADA, geographic size, and longevity. The SPR for some variable groupings with a small n did not have sufficient agreement to produce five primary responsibilities. The SPR for each subgroup did not differ substantially from the composite analysis. The SPR for all groupings contained most of the same responsibilities but in somewhat different priority; however, the variable of High and Medium Longevity reported the additional responsibility of "supervising and coordinating, as assigned, for special education teachers and resource specialists."

Table 4.4

Synthesis of the Program Specialists' Responsibilities

Classified by ADA, Geographic Size (Geog.) and

Longevity

Responsibilities	Range of responsibility** given by											
	LARGE ADA			MEDIUM ADA			SMALL ADA			LONGEVITY		
	Large Geog.	Medium Geog.	Small Geog.	Large Geog.	Medium Geog.	Small Geog.	Large Geog.	Medium Geog.	Small Geog.	Low	Medium	High
1. Consult with teachers	-	1	-	2	-	4	-	-	-	1	1	-
2. Plan and/or participate in each school's staff and program development	1	3	-	3	1	2	1	1	-	3	2	1
3. Provide assistance to assure that pupils have full educational opportunity	-	2	1	1	2	1	2	-	-	5	4	3
4. Assist in coordinating special programs between and among districts	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	5	5
5. Coordinate the development of IEPs for students with parents and staff	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	2	-	-	-
6. Present inservice/workshops in areas of expertise upon request	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-
7. Monitor the implementation and evaluation of IEP	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
8. Review program/pupil progress and recommend program revisions when appropriate/directed	-	-	3	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-
9. Participate in ongoing development and revision of curriculum framework handbooks for teachers of children with learning handicaps	-	-	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. Supervise and coordinate, as assigned, special education teachers and resource specialists	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	2
11. Observe students and/or total classroom environments	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2		4

- blank spaces indicate that no significant agreement was reported

** Scale is 1 to 5 (1 = most primary--5 = least primary)

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented summary findings on the role, responsibilities, and perceived importance of the program specialist in 81 of the 97 SELPAs of California. Data collected from survey responses by the Directors and Participating Program Specialists (PPS) were presented in narrative and tabular form. The Directors' perceived importance was synthesized to yield a Composite Rating of Program Specialists' Importance (CRPSI). The rank of 4.2, interpreted as "very important," was the computed CRPSI for the seven areas of perceived importance. The areas of "Communication" and "Support" received the highest rating of importance by a majority (68-69%) of the respondents. "Effectiveness" and "Expertise" were the next highest areas of importance.

The CRPSI was also displayed by subgroups determined by ADA, geographic size and program specialits's longevity. Lower CRPSIs (3.4 - 3.7) were computed for the variables of Small ADA--Small Geographic Size and Low Longevity. The highest CRPSIs (4.5 - 4.7) were computed for the variables of Large ADA--Small Geographic Size and High Longevity. From the data, there appeared to be a higher evaluated importance of the program specialist's role in SELPAs with large ADA or high longevity.

The primary responsibilities reported by the PPSs were synthesized to yield a Synthesis of Program Specialists' Primary Responsibilities (SPR). The SPR was also displayed by subgroups of the above-mentioned variables. The SPR yielded a cluster of four primary responsibilities and five secondary responsibilities. The responsibility of "Consulting

with Teachers" was the highest (74%) rated primary responsibility. The other three responsibilities for the SPR were:

Planning and/or participating in each school's staff and program development.

Provide assistance to assure the pupils have full educational opportunity.

Assist in coordinating special programs between and among districts.

The variables of ADA and Geographic Size did not appear to affect the SPR. All groupings seem to have either the four primary responsibilities reported in the total SPR or one or more of the secondary responsibilities. Since ranking the responsibilities was requested, agreement regarding the rank of each responsibility was generally low. Also, the sequence of each grouping's SPR varied; however, agreement appeared to prevail in the overall list of responsibilities. The variable group of High Longevity did display the responsibility, "supervise and coordinate, as assigned, special education teachers and resource specialists" which differed from the SPR listing of other variable groups.

The CRPSI and SPR will be the focus of Chapter 5's discussion and the basis for the Consensus Model of the Program Specialist's Role and Position Description. Recommendations for further study are discussed in the next chapter also.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This chapter discusses the conclusions derived from the data. Attention was given to findings that affect the program specialist's role and position description. From these data, two products are presented and discussed: The Composite Rating of Program Specialists' Importance (CRPSI) and A Consensus Model of the Program Specialist's Role and Position Description. Recommendations for further research, and the potential contribution of this study to the educational field conclude this discussion.

Findings of the Directors' Survey

The Directors' Survey was designed to evaluate the program specialist's importance to the operation of the SELPA. Seven areas of importance were evaluated. The evaluation of importance by area recorded in Table 4.1 in Chapter 4 reported the areas of "Communication" and "Support" as very important by the highest percentage of Directors. "Communication," as it was defined in Chapter 1, is the process of interchanging ideas and information. This might be expanded upon with regard to the program specialist to include keeping one's self and others around him/her informed of the pertinent changes and events which affect his/her role and the operation of his/her organization. In view of the diversity of needs manifested in a SELPA and the continuous state of transition in students, personnel, legislation, monies, etc., it appears quite appropriate that the Directors felt

program specialists were most important in the area of "Communication."

"Support" was the area rated highest as "extremely important" (69%) on the Directors' Survey. In rating "Support" as extremely important, the Directors may be indicating that the organization is only as strong as its foundation or "Support." "Support" may have been marked quite often because it is a more encompassing term than some of the other survey areas. Since "Support" might well mean assist, manage, or follow through, Directors may utilize their program specialist as an extension of their own job and responsibilities and thus view the program specialist as extremely important in the area of "Support." Bolton (1973) described a supervision system that utilizes support personnel as assistants to the supervisor in which all responsibilities for service are the supervisor's and support personnel do the delegated responsibilities as assigned.

"Effectiveness" and "Expertise" received the next highest ratings on the Directors' Survey. Effectiveness is relative to the expectations held for the role (Harris et al., 1979). In spite of the fact that the program specialist's role has appeared vague and undefined, the Directors felt their program specialists were producing the desired outcome.

Along with "Effectiveness," "Expertise" received a substantial rating of importance by the Directors. Since special education does require specialized approaches and a refined, cumulative bank of methodologies and resources, it is not surprising that this area was rated as extremely important. This area, above all others on the

survey, is the one that focuses on the uniqueness of the program specialist. Most other educational roles, such as teacher, principal, etc., might be evaluated for their "Effectiveness" or "Communication" abilities; however, the area of "Expertise" is not commonly a required qualification or evaluation item. Watson (1975) stated that it is acceptable to expect competence but not so with "Expertise," perhaps because people who are truly experts are not in abundance. On the other hand, "Expertise" is a requirement of the program specialist as stated in the Master Plan (Senate Bill 1870, 1980). Therefore, the fact that 57 percent of the SELPA directors indicated "Expertise" was extremely important may show they recognize the intent of the law as well as utilize their program specialist in roles requiring special expertise.

Another area rated as extremely important by 50 percent of the Directors was the area of "Efficiency." In view of the budget constraints, array of service needs, and relatively small number of program specialists (one per 850 IWENS), "Efficiency" should ensure a congruency between service rendered and energy expended.

The area of "Efficiency" along with "Expertise" has a more personal connotation accompanying it. Whereas other areas on the survey, such as "Coordination" or "Compliance," address the duties of the program specialist, "Efficiency," as well as "Expertise," are directed more toward the person, i.e., the Directors must look at what the program specialist is doing or has done for most of the areas, but for "Efficiency" and "Expertise," the Directors must look at the person

and view how something was accomplished. The individual difference in program specialists may be the reason that "Expertise" and "Efficiency" were not rated as high. It is one thing to evaluate procedures, but quite another to evaluate qualities. Many experts agree that evaluation is difficult and even avoided if personal characteristics are included in the criteria (Harris et al., 1979).

The areas of "Meeting Compliance" and "Coordination" were evaluated as important by the fewest number of Directors. Because "Meeting Compliance" involves so many checks and balances, much of it involving dollars and the legal mandates and restraints, this area is more important to the Director's role and may require less involvement of the program specialist.

"Coordination," on the other hand, was only slightly below 50 percent in being evaluated as extremely important by the Directors (46%) and received a 32 percent rating as "very important." The CRPSI in the area of "Coordination" also reflected a "very important" rating (4.3%), thus substantiating this area as important to the SELPAs' operation. The IEP process alone involves constant coordination of the appropriate personnel, services, placements, goals, objectives, etc., all of which program specialists and, often the coordinators, are involved. Staff development activities require coordination also, and program specialists are often involved or directly coordinating such activities.

The Composite Ratings of Program Specialists' Importance (CRPSI)

Findings from the Directors' Survey yielded a Composite Rating which was tabulated and displayed in Chapter 4. The CRPSI of 4.2 which

equalled an assigned narrative rating of "very important," was the cumulative result of the 81 SELPA Directors. It was reported by SRI (1980) that program specialist importance (defined by SRI as "need") was not nearly as high as the CRPSI. Thirty to 42 percent of the teachers surveyed by SRI indicated that the program specialist was not needed, i.e., not important. However, the SRI study only surveyed 17 SELPAs, none of which had been a SELPA for more than two years. Therefore, it is probable that the program specialist's role was unclear. At that time, 1978, the concern with appropriating monies for direct service to children was the way of thinking (Reynolds, 1978). It seems quite apparent in the SRI and Campbell (1981) studies that the worth of most Master Plan jobs and/or positions was evaluated by its service to children. By asking their questions to direct service personnel such as teachers it appeared that the program specialists were being evaluated as to their direct service capacity instead of their support capacity. Therefore, the CRPSI not only represents a more current and representative sample, but it also evaluates the program specialist by a criterion which seemingly measures what they actually do. The fact that the CRPSI was completed by the program specialist's supervisors instead of the recipient of his/her service, agrees with the evaluation guidelines suggested by Harris et al., (1979) in that it is the process of service that allows a view of role importance more readily than evaluating the product of the service. An evaluation which focuses on the worth of products is often subjective and individualized. A more global perspective was offered in the evaluation

process of the program specialist for this study. By asking the Directors to consider the operational needs of their SELPA and the importance of the program specialist in meeting those needs, the CRPSI (i.e., a rating of very important), represents a more valid evaluation of the program specialist role than previous studies.

The CRPSI as It Is Affected by ADA, Geographic Size and Longevity

The responding SELPAs were divided into subgroups by the variables of ADA, geographic size and longevity. All groups yielded a CRPSI which fell in the 3.4 to 4.7 range which was a rating of "very important to extremely important." This indicated that the variables of ADA, geographic size, and longevity did not substantially affect the CRPSI. The small ADA and geographic size subgroup was somewhat lower than the general CRPSI. This may be explained by the element of smallness meaning fewer problems and thereby less need. Small SELPAs appear to utilize their program specialist as assessors and/or consultants; therefore, the actual operation of the SELPA may not be as affected by the program specialist.

The variables of large ADA and small geographic size, which yielded the highest variable group CRPSI, may be explained by the sheer nature of too many people in too small an area. Investigation of the SELPAs which make up this subgroup revealed many inner-city SELPAs along with the highly populated Los Angeles and San Francisco Bay Areas. Therefore, in situations with crowded conditions, support personnel may be considered more important.

The variable of program specialist longevity was divided into

three groups: low (one year), medium (two-three years) and high (three-plus years). The low longevity group yielded a lower CRPSI (3.7) than the other two groups; however, 3.7 is still roughly equivalent to "very important." Considering the possiblity of problems involved in the management of an organization during its first year of operation, it is notable that the program specialist was rated so highly.

Findings of the Primary Responsibilities Survey

The Primary Responsibilities Survey was designed to validate the actual and primary responsibilities of the program specialist in the California SELPAs. The nine areas of the survey are areas of service which listed detailed services provided to the SELPA. In viewing the frequency distribution of responses that indicated which responsibilities were part of their job, high percentages indicated that the nine areas were indeed actual responsibilities of their job. Those areas were:

1) Consultation
2) Coordination
3) Communication
4) Staff and Program Development
5) Support
6) Compliance
7) Management
8) Supervisory
9) Evaluation

Even though the areas of service and responsibilities listed on the

Primary Responsibilities Survey were extracted from the SELPAs' program specialist job descriptions, it was not certain, prior to this study, that program specialists actually provided service in these areas. Percentages in seven of the nine areas were predominently above 50 percent agreement, thereby validating these areas for the role description.

Two areas were not consistently above 50 percent agreement. The areas of "Management" and "Supervisory" displayed lower agreement percentages which may indicate that many program specialists do not primarily manage and supervise in their roles. Thirty-nine percent of the PPSs indicated they had responsibilities in these areas.

Each area included an "Other" section which permitted the addition of duties the respondent was responsible for, but was different from those listed. Areas which received the most other write-ins were "Coordination" and "Evaluation." However, the responsibilities which were written in these areas were all individual responses; i.e., no other respondent listed these responsibilities. (Appendix I)

It is apparent in viewing the data that program specialists are responsible for a vast array of services, and appear to wear "many hats" in performing their duties for their SELPA. However, it is also shown that these duties do fall into particular categories of service. In view of this finding, it is now important to look again at the responsibilities agreed upon by respondents and discuss which of these were indicated as primary responsibilities.

Synthesis of the Program Specialists' Primary Responsibilities (SPR)

The PPSs were asked to indicate the five responsibilities they considered their primary responsibilities and to rank these from one to five, with one being the most primary. A responsibility was arbitrarily pre-set at 50 percent agreement; however, the data appeared to cluster differently and was therefore, described as it clustered. This procedure produced significant agreement in four of the 65 responsibilities (Table 4.3), which were designated as Primary Responsibilities. Another cluster of five responsibilities received roughly 20 percent agreement by the PPSs. These additional responsibilities, entitled Secondary Responsibilities were included as part of the SPR.

"Consulting with teachers" was the primary responsibility designated as most primary by 74 percent of the PPSs. Research supports the need for consultation to teachers (Falik & Sichel, 1972; Dunn, 1963; Meyen, 1968) as well as the Master Plan which states that program specialists will "consult with resource specialists, designated instruction and service instructors, and special class teachers." Along with this support, the CRPSI generated from the data in the study reported that the SELPA directors viewed program specialists as essential to the operation of the SELPA in the area of "Expertise." One way for the program specialist to serve a SELPA in the area of "Expertise" is via consultation.

"Plan and/or participate in each school's staff and program development" received a 51 percent rating as a primary responsibility by the

PPSs. Once again, research firmly supports the need for staff and program development (Duffy, 1971; Public Law 85-926, 1966; Warnat, 1978; Mackie et al., 1959). The CRPSI emphasis on "Expertise" and "Coordination" also lends support to the responsibility of involvement in staff and program development.

"Providing assistance to assure that pupils have full educational opportunity" was rated as a primary responsibility by 40 percent of the PPSs. This responsibility on the actual survey went on to say "regardless of the district of residence, such as attend IEP meetings regarding placement change, gather data for Complaint or Due Process, and follow-up of Complaint and Due Process." Under the area of "Compliance," this responsibility is perhaps confusing yet quite important from a legal point of view. Many experts feel that there needs to be a person in the SELPA who has this responsibility (Turnbull, 1977; Burrello, 1974; CAPS, 1982); however, due to the involvement one must have to be an expert on the laws and monitoring "Compliance," it is more likely that the SELPA directors handle this responsibility and perhaps delegate portions of it such as the IEP development or Due Process procedures (SRI, 1980; Zinck et al., 1980). The CRPSI in the area of "Compliance" was rated as important, but was the lowest of the seven areas. This further substantiates that "Compliance" is a responsibility, but not as primary as others.

"Assist in coordinating special programs between and among districts" received 35 percent agreement as a primary responsibility by the PPSs. This responsibility was further described on several SELPA

position descriptions as "facilitating appropriate educational placements for pupils regardless of their district of residence." The fact that program specialists are mandated for each 850 IWENs may imply that they will serve numerous schools and/or school districts and, therefore, have more opportunity to be aware of the SELPAs programs. Thus a responsibility of "Coordinating" appears applicable and suitable. The CRPSI in the area of "Coordination" supports this area as a primary responsibility by rating it as "extremely important" and/or "very important" by a majority of the SELPA directors.

Secondary Responsibilities for the SPR

There were five secondary responsibilities for the SPR which are worthy of mention because they displayed approximately 20 percent agreement (Table 4.3). These additional areas appear to relate to the top four areas just discussed and will, therefore, be paired with each of the top four to display responsibilities as follows:

1. Consult with teachers. Review program/pupil progress and recommend program revisions when appropriate/directed.
2. Plan and/or participate in each school's staff and program development. Present inservice/workshops in areas of expertise upon request.
3. Provide assistance to assure that pupils have full educational opportunity.
4. Assist in coordinating the development of Individual Education Programs (IEP) and/or special programs with parents and staff within, between and among school districts.

Monitor the implementation and evaluation of the IEP Program.

"Coordinate the development of the Individual Education Program (IEP) for students with parents and staff" was rated as a primary responsibility for 24 percent of the program specialists. The development of the IEP is a process which involves detailed procedures and a multidisciplinary approach (numerous personnel of varied expertise) (Turnbull, 1977). Many districts have defined a "case manager" role to be carried out by a designated staff person who coordinates the IEP process. This may or may not be the program specialist; however, the findings of this study reported that a significant number of PPSs, 88 percent, are responsible for this duty. Once again, the CRPSI substantiates the area of "Coordination" as most important to the SELPA operation and thereby lends support to this responsibility as a primary duty. Item number 49 on the Survey, which was:

Develop a record-keeping system which will track all services and mandated follow-up. Maintain case records on referred students as appropriate,

was listed as an additional responsibility to the SPR; however, it is not included in the above groupings. Many SELPAs have or are implementing a computerized management information service which handles or will handle this responsibility (P. Gonos, SEACO representative, personal communication, May, 1982).

SPR by Variable Subgroups

Although it was questioned whether the variables of ADA,

geographic size, and longevity affected the SPR, no substantial differences in the SPR existed for the variable groups of ADA and geographic size. The primary responsibilities for each group were essentially the same but in different order of priority.

The variable of longevity did show an additional responsibility for the SPR on the medium and high subgroups. This additional responsibility is "Supervise and coordinate (programs) as assigned, special education teachers and resource specialists." Since the additional responsibility only appears in the subgroups that contain program specialists who have higher longevity, it could be assumed that the program specialists have been given more supervisory duties because of their more established role.

The CRPSI has provided data which establishes the importance of the program specialist's role and in what areas. The SPR validates the primary responsibilities of the program specialist's role by program specialists in the field and also shows agreement with the CRPSI. These data were necessary to address the questions of this study and meet the goal of developing a consensus model of role and job description for the program specialist. The following model is based on the findings of the CRPSI and SPR and the guidelines for writing job descriptions reviewed in Chapter 2.

A Consensus Model of the Program Specialist's Role and Position Description

Position Identification: (date) _____

PROGRAM SPECIALIST

SPECIAL EDUCATION LOCAL PLAN AREA (SELPA)

_____
(County/District/Consortium)

Salary Schedule _____
(Consultant, pupil personnel, management, teacher, etc.)

Immediate Supervisor _____

Application Deadline _____

Starting Date _____

Position Summary:

The program specialist is an active member in the service delivery model for the SELPA and provides necessary services which:

1) Supports the operation of the SELPA
2) Enhances communication among and between districts and agencies
3) Offers expertise and resources
4) Assists in the effectiveness and efficiency of the operation
5) Coordinates services and programs, and
6) Assists in meeting compliance

Assigned responsibilities fall under the general categories of:

1) Consultation

2) Staff and Program Development

3) Compliance, and,

4) Coordination

Position Responsibilities:

The program specialist is assigned the following responsibilities:

1. Consults with teachers and other school/district/or agency personnel as appropriate in the delivery of services for the SELPA.
2. Observes students and/or classrooms as requested or in establishing a global information base regarding the District or Consortium's Programs.
3. Coordinates, when appropriate, the development of the IEP for students with parents and staff, particularly when students are moving to a different program and/or different location.
4. Plans or participates in staff or program development for assigned schools/other schools, staff groups or agencies by request of expertise.
5. Assists in coordinating special programs between and among districts and reviews program/pupil progress for possible recommendations or revisions where appropriate.
6. Specific duties as delegated by immediate supervisor.

Position Specifications:

Knowledge of: A specialized indepth knowledge in at least one of the following areas: Communicatively Handicapped, Severely Handicapped, Physically Handicapped and Learning Handicapped. Assessment, curriculum, staff development and inservice; behavior management techniques, vocational assessment and training, communication and organizational skills, current legislation pertaining to special education, and service agencies dealing with special education children.*

Experience: _____ years teaching experience with a minimum of three years of successful experience in the education of individuals with exceptional needs.

Education/ Requirements: Master's Degree from an accredited institution of higher education and a valid special education credential.

*Note: Suggested in the laws, S.B. 1870, Rodda, 1980 and S.B. 769, Sieroty, 1981.

Recommendations for Further Research:

The findings of this study have potential utility for a clarification of the program specialist role for all educational personnel. Areas of further investigation which will extend this research are:

1) Current school personnel perceptions of program specialist

services upon receipt of such service. For example, a pre and post perceptionnaire; and,

2) An investigation nationwide of service delivery models in order to ascertain if a program specialist role even exists, and if not, if and how the model offers the program specialist's services.

Potential Contribution to the Educational Field

The data collected in this study provided a field evaluation and validation of an unexplored issue in special education--the program specialist's role. By obtaining an 83 percent return of respondents, synthesizing the data and considering the variables that may affect the program specialist's role, the final result is as close to a current consensus model as prevails in the literature to date. With the tone of recent hearings and the legislation proposed in special education particularly concerning personnel, the data presented here provided information on the role of the program specialist for those legislators deciding its fate.

REFERENCES

Ary, D., Jacobs, L., & Razavich, A. Introduction to research in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1972.

Assembly Bill 4040 Education Code related to Special Education. Lanterman et al., 1974. Sacramento, California.

Assembly Bill 1250 Education Code related to Special Education. Lanterman et al., 1977. Sacramento, California.

Assembly Bill 3635 Education Code related to Special Education. Lanterman et al., 1978. Sacramento, California.

Barbacovi, D. The Handicapped Children's Act--P.L. 94-142: Implications for principals. Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1977.

Bassler, J. "Interdisciplinary needs in reading." Illinois Journal of Education, 1967, 58, 3-4.

Blackhurst, A. & Berdine, W. An introduction to special education. Little, Brown, & Company, 1981.

Bolton, D. Selection and evaluation of teachers. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Company, 1973.

Burrello, L. et al. Special education and litigation: implications for professional and educational practice. Columbus, Ohio: University Council on Educational Administration, 1974.

California Education Code: Administration, Section 33150e, p. 126, June, 1975.

California State Plan, Title VI Elementary and Secondary Education Act Sacramento: California State Board of Education, 1967.

Campbell, J. Role delineation of the program specialists and the resource specialist under the California Master Plan for special education. Santa Barbara, California: University of California presented to the Office of Special Education, California State Department of Education, 1981.

CAPS Register of member and non-member program specialists in California. Unpublished registrar. Walnut Creek, Ca.: Master Plan Unit I c/o Cathy Cala Cliff, president, 1982.

Cawelti, G. "Innovative practices in high schools." Nation's Schools.

Collins, K. et al. Key words in education. London: Longman Group Limited, 1973.

Cook, A. Demographic information survey. Unpublished report presented to the California Association of Program Specialists (CAPS). Walnut Creek, California: Master Plan Unit I c/o Cathy Cala Cliff, president, 1981.

Councel, J. & Clavering, R. "Job performance criterion." Employment Today, 1977, 10 25.

Cruickshank, W. & Johnson, O. Education of exceptional children and youth. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

Dunn, L. Exceptional children in the schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963.

Duffy, P. "Higher education expands special education teacher-training programs." Nation's Schools, 1971, 108, 24-28.

Falik, L. & Sichel, J. "Classroom consultation as an intervention strategy." The Reading Teacher, 1972, 116, 187-192.

Factor Evaluation System. "How to write position descriptions," U.S. Civil Service Commission, 1979.

Gearheart, B. (Ed.) Education of the exceptional child: history, present practices, and trends. Scranton, Pa: Intext Publishers Group, 1972.

Geer, W., Connor, L. & Blackman, L. "Recent federal legislation-provisions and implications for special education." Exceptional Children: 1965, 28, 411-421.

Goldberg, I. "Profiles of special education personnel: an analysis of professional experiences." Exceptional Children, 1957, 23, 238-40.

Good, C. Dictionary of education. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1973.

Goodhart, S. "The recognition of Dementia Praecox. "The Medical Record, 1910, 19, 6-10.

Gordon, R. (Ed) Toward a manpower policy. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Griffing, B. Special education in California. Sacramento, Ca: California State Department of Education, 1970.

Grossman, M. The exceptional child. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917.

Grossman, S. Role and function, a time study. Unpublished Masters thesis, California State University, Hayward, 1979.

Harris, B. et al. Personnel administration in education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc. 1979.

Heller, H. "Training of professional personnel." Exceptional Children, 1968, 34, 539-544.

Henderson, R. Job descriptions: Critical documents-versatile tools, Reston, Virginia: Reston Publishing Company, 1976.

Hopkins, K. & Glass, G. Basic statistics for the behavioral sciences. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1978.

Instructor Magazine "Opinion Poll" 1968, 150, 16.

Jordan, T. The exceptional child. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc. 1962.

Keefe, R., Larson, H., & Peterson, G. "Master Plan for special education-Why it's working." Thrust For Educational Leadership, 1979, 14, 10-12.

Kelly, L. & Vergason, G. Dictionary of special education and rehabilitation, Denver: Love Publishing Company, 1978.

Kennedy, Virginia. The program specialist: Exemplary practices. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, Office of Special Education, 1980.

Knezevich, S. Administration of public education. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

Lerner, J. Children with learning disabilities. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971.

McGuckin, P. Interim report of the legislative advisory committee on special education. (Pursuant to Chapter 1094 of Senate Bill 769) Senate Education Committee. Sacramento, California, 1981.

Mackie, R. & Engel, A. Directors and supervisors of special education in local school systems. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, & Welfare. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955.

Mackie, R., Dunn, L., & Cain, L. Professional preparation for teachers of exceptional children: An overview. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education Bulletin, Government Printing Office, 1959.

Martin, E. "The U.S. Office of Education primes the pump." Nation's Schools, 1969, 84, 57-64.

Meisgeier, C. The identification of successful teachers of mentally or physically handicapped children. In Meisgeier & King (Ed.), The process of special education administration. Scranton, Pa: International Textbook Co., 1970.

Meyen, E. "A statewide approach to inservice training for teachers of the mentally retarded." Exceptional Children, 1968, 34, 531-536.

Meyen, E. Exceptional children and youth: an introduction. Denver: Love Publishing Co., 1978.

Mills, et. al. v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia et. al. Civil Action. U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, 1972.

Mitchell, D. "Schools and classes for exceptional children." Cleveland Education Survey, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 1916.

Page, T. & Thomas, J.B. International dictionary of education. New York: Nichols Publishing Company, 1977.

Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children for Bowman et. al. v. the Common Wealth of Pennsylvania, Kurzman et. al. Civil Action 71-42. U.S. District Court for Eastern District of Pennsylvania, 1970.

Public Law 85-926, as Amended. Grants for Teaching in the Education of Handicapped Children. Washington, D.C., 1966.

Public Law 90-35. The Education Professions Development Act. Washington, D.C., 1971.

Public Law 94-142. The Education for all Handicapped Children's Act. Washington, D.C., 1975.

Reynolds, M.C. Changing roles of special education personnel. Paper presented to the University and College Educators in America (UCEA) annual conference, Chicago, 1973 disseminated by Council for Exceptional Children, Reston, Va.

Reynolds, M.C. Futures of education for exceptional students: Emergency structures. Reston, Va: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

Senate Bill 1870, Rodda. California Special Education Master Plan. Sacramento, 1980.

Senate Bill 769, Sieroty. As amended. Special Education: School Finance. Sacramento, 1981.

Smith, B. A Definition of the roles and functions of the program specialist and the resource specialist under A.B. 1250. Unpublished Masters thesis. Sacramento: California State University, Sacramento, 1980.

Stanford Research Institute (SRI), An evaluation of the California Master Plan. Supported by a grant from the Office of Special Education, California State Department of Education, 1980.

Turnbull, A. & Schulz, J. Mainstreaming handicapped students: a guide for the classroom teacher. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1977.

Title V Regulations, Senate Bill 1870/3075. Rodda, Sacramento, California, 1980.

U.S. Department of Labor. Job Analysis. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

Warnat, W. "Inservice education: Key to P.L. 94-142's service to handicapped children and youth" Educational Leadership, 1978, 70, 474-478.

Watson, R. "Job evaluations and pay plans" in Organizational structure for employment, Johnson, K.; Burke, J. & Robins, P. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1975.

Wilson, R. "Employment trends in education." Nations Schools, 1956, 70, 38-42.

Woolf, H. (Ed.) Webster's new collegiate dictionary. Springfield, Massachusetts: G & C Merriam Co., 1982.

Zinck, R. Ann et al. The development of a working paper for improving the efficiency of the Individualized Education Program. Stockton, California: Bureau of Education of Research and Field Services, University of the Pacific, 1980.

TO: ALL Directors of Special Education Local Plan Areas

FROM: Peter T. Gonos, Director
Special Education Local Plan Areas

Cheryl McElhany, Program Specialist

Many of you responded last Fall to the beginning stages of a project we have undertaken to clarify the program specialist's role and responsibilities for the Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA). We thank you for this valuable data. Attached is the second and final stage of the study which involves an evaluation of the program specialist, to be completed by the SELPA Director, and a validation of the program specialist's responsibilities, to be completed by a representative program specialist.

Your assistance is needed greatly in this study. We anticipate that the results will be significantly worth your efforts, and you will be one of the first to receive the findings.

Please fill out the SELPA Director's questionnaire, request one of your program specialists to complete the Primary Responsibilities Survey, and return both in the addressed, stamped envelope by March 24, 1982.

Thank you for your support of this important research.

PTG:CH:at
enclosures

SELPA DIRECTORS SURVEY/QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate the number of years your SELPA has employed program specialist(s). _____ 1 year _____ 2 years _____ 3 years _____ more than 3 years

Please indicate the approximate ADA of your SELPA _____ and, approximate square miles of your SELPA _____.

Please attach your program specialist job description and return by _____.

Rate the importance of the program specialist position in regards to the operation of your SELPA as it relates to the following areas of concern:

(For your convenience the terms are defined below.)

Areas of Importance	1. Not Important	2. Somewhat Important	3. Important	4. Very Important	5. Extremely Important
1. Meeting compliance	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Coordination	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Communication	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Effectiveness	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Efficiency	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Expertise	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. Support	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

1. Meeting compliance - Assuring that all state and federal regulations are followed adhered to pertaining to an appropriate educational program in the least restrictive education environment.
2. Coordination - The process of unifying the contributions of people, materials, and other resources toward the achievement of a recognized purpose.
3. Communication - The process of interchanging ideas and information in an on-going manner.
4. Effectiveness - The producing of a desired outcome or power to produce desired outcomes.
5. Efficiency - The ability to achieve desired results with economy of time and effort in relation to the amount of work accomplished.
6. Expertise - Having, involving, or displaying special skill or knowledge derived from training or experience.
7. Support - The performance of all tasks in a manner and to a purpose that will uphold and strengthen other personnel in achieving the results properly expected of each as incumbant of a post in the organization.

PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE

PROGRAM SPECIALIST SURVEY

Dear Program Specialist:

I am writing to request your assistance for a study which concerns a very controversial issue, the program specialist role. It appears to be a popular subject for debate as many of the special education professional organization's agenda have indicated. It is most certainly a concern of the legislature for future funding purposes.

Along with this growing concern, research has revealed that the program specialist role is one of the least adequately defined positions created by California's Master Plan. However, studies have supported the need for such a position and surveyed school personnel have reported strong satisfaction with their program specialists.

Recent legislative amendments have put the program specialist position in jeopardy. Therefore, SEACO, SELPA Directors, CTA, and CEC have called for the California Association of Program Specialists to unify their various responsibilities and produce a well-defined role description.

In view of this movement, this study is attempting to evaluate the program specialist role and its importance as it relates to certain variables. One area that appears undefined is the primary responsibilities of the program specialist. An itemization of the job responsibilities extracted from all California SELPA job descriptions has been compiled. You may be interested to view the great number and variety of responsibilities as we were. Many seem general, while others appear quite specific. As the Representative Program Specialist for your SELPA, your analysis of this list will offer valuable insight toward compiling a primary responsibilities list.

Please complete the attached survey and give to your Director to return in the self-addressed stamped envelope before March 25, 1982.

We thank you for your support of this important research.

Respectfully,

Peter T. Gonos
Director
San Joaquin SELPA

Cheryl A. McElhany
Program Specialist

PTG:CAM:at
Enclosure

PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE

PROGRAM SPECIALIST SURVEY

Directions: In Column I below is a composite list of the program specialist job responsibilities as listed on the job descriptions for each SELPA in California. Please NOTE that a responsibility on one SELPA job description may be essentially the same as a responsibility listed on another SELPA job description, but with slightly different wording. The composite list below reflects all responsibilities from all SELPA's which are essentially different and lists them with concise wording. Please read each responsibility and do the following:

1. Indicate in Column II with a check (✓) all of those responsibilities you are actually responsible for.

2. Indicate in Column III from those checked which are the five most primary responsibilities and rank them from 1 to 5 (with 1 being the most primary). Primary responsibilities are those responsibilities for which your supervisor holds you directly accountable and which consume a significant percentage of your work day or week (20% or higher).

I Composite List of Job Responsibilities	II Actual Responsibility of my Job	III Primary Responsibility of my Job (max. 5)
A. CONSULTATION		
1. Consult with administrators		
2. Consult with other multi-disciplinary personnel		
3. Consult with parents		
4. Consult with teachers		
5. Interpret curriculum & instructional program to the Board of Education, the administration, the staff & the general public		
6. Provide expertise and guidance in developing career and vocational special needs programs		
7. Demonstration teaching		
8. Observe students and/or total classroom environment		
9. Locate resource materials/ equipment for teachers/school personnel		
10. Attend IEP meetings as a resource person		

I Composite List of Job Responsibilities	II Actual Responsibility of my Job	III Primary Responsibility of my Job (max. 5)
A. CONSULTATION (cont'd)		
11. Provide consultation primarily in one specialized area or areas of your expertise		
12. Provide for individual or small group counseling and for behavior change instruction as requested		
13. Other (specify service)		
B. COORDINATION		
14. Coordinate career/vocational education opportunities for students		
15. Assist in the coordination of preschool and out-of-district referrals		
16. Assist in coordinating special programs between and among districts		
17. Coordinate, as appropriate, the development of IEP for students with parents and staff		
18. Other (specify service)		
C. COMMUNICATION		
19. Compile data for non-public school placements as requested		
20. Assist in designing/implementing effective communication procedures/documents for distribution to all SELPA personnel		
21. Attend conferences, meet with other professionals, and disseminate information to school personnel		
22. Provide liaison between parents, teachers and administrators concerning the needs and programs of IWENS		

I Composite List of Job Responsibilities	II Actual Responsibility of my Job	III Primary Responsibility of my Job (max. 5)
C. COMMUNICATION (cont'd)		
23. Provide liaison among district, private schools and state schools for designated programs		
24. Keep the Director of the SELPA informed of activities and suggests new policies to improve services		
25. Assist in the articulation of special education between all schools		
26. Other (specify service)		
D. STAFF & PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
27. Assist in assessment of needs for inservice		
28. Plan and/or participate in each school's staff development programs, program development, and innovation of special methods and approaches		
29. Provide classroom demonstrations and model teaching on request		
30. Develop a continuum for use in writing differential proficiency standards & assists teachers and resource specialists in the writing of differential standards		
31. Assist teachers and rincipals to develop appropriate instructional techniques within the context of the regular class curriculum and orders materials appropriate to this task		
32. Participate in ongoing development and revision of curriculum framework handbooks for teachers of children with learning handicaps		
33. Presents inservice/workshops in areas of expertise upon request		
34. Other (specify service)		

I Composite List of Job Responsibilities	II Actual Responsibility of my Job	III Primary Responsibility of my Job (max. 5)
E. SUPPORT		
35. Assist in interpretation of assessment data for developing/modifying instructional plans		
36. Assist in the gathering of regional data related to pupil count, special studies, pupil history, information etc.		
37. Assist in the supervision of the special education materials center operation		
38. Work with the Special Olympic Committee to continue its ongoing program for the retarded		
39. Assist in, provide for, and actively participate in the dept.'s Race/Human Relations Program		
40. Assist in parent training and establishing effective communications		
41. Review and help in writing of grants		
42. Encourage implementation of innovative special methods and approaches for individuals with exceptional needs		
43. Other (specify service)		
F. COMPLIANCE		
44. Monitor the implementation and evaluation of the IEP program as necessary and appropriate		
45. Provide assistance in order to assure that pupils have full educational opportunity regardless of the district of residence, such as: attend IEP meeting re: placement change, gather data for Complaint or Due Process; follow-up of Complaint or Due Process		

I Composite List of Job Responsibilities	II Actual Responsibility of my Job	III Primary Responsibility of my Job (max. 5)
F. COMPLIANCE (cont'd) 46. Maintain knowledge of current laws & regulations pertaining to IWENS and may be assigned to prepare fair hearing material		
47. Monitor compliance with Federal, State and Regional guidelines		
48. Other (specify service)		
G. MANAGEMENT 49. Develop a record-keeping system which will track all services & mandated follow-up. Maintain case records on referred students as appropriate		
50. Serve as the Special Education transportation representative		
51. Propose appropriate budget requisites		
52. Establish, maintain & support standards of personal conduct & discipline in accordance with the current discipline policy		
53. Other (specify service)		
H. SUPERVISORY 54. Interview and participate in the selection of candidates for SELPA teaching positions		
55. Supervise & evaluate assigned certificated staff		
56. Supervise & evaluate assigned clerical personnel staff		
57. Assist & supervise student teachers & interns used in special classes		

I Composite List of Job Responsibilities	II Actual Responsibility of my Job	III Primary Responsibility of my Job (max. 5)
H. SUPERVISORY (cont'd) 58. Provide direct supervision and program coordination to assigned special education teachers and resource specialists		
59. Serve as administrative designee to SAT referrals for county-class placement and for IEP meetings of county special day classes, within assigned geographic areas		
60. Other (specify service)		
I. EVALUATION 61. Review program/pupil progress and recommend program revisions when appropriate/directed		
62. Assist in assessing effectiveness of district programs for the handicapped		
63. Prepare annual and interim reports as directed		
64. Give input to building administrators for evaluation of resource specialists and SDC teachers		
65. Other (specify service)		

APPENDIX C

Follow-Up Procedure for the SELPA Directors Questionnaire

Directors who did not respond to the SELPA Directors Questionnaire by the requested date were phoned and the below questions were asked:

1. Did you receive a SELPA Directors Questionnaire?

2. If "yes," would it be possible for you to return the questionnaire within the next two days?

3. If "no," then a brief explanation of the project would be given and his/her involvement requested. Another questionnaire would be mailed.

4. If he/she received the questionnaires, but did not wish to respond, he/she would be asked to indicate if his/her reason was lack of time, lack of interest, or other. These indications will be recorded appropriately.

APPENDIX D

Panel of Representative Authorities For Content Validation of Instruments

1. Dr. Michael Bower
   Professor of Educational Psychology
   California State University, Berkeley

2. Dr. Joseph Roberts
   Associate Professor
   Department of Special Education
   University of the Pacific

3. Ms. Harriet Danford
   Director, Special Education Local Plan Area
   Office of the Los Angeles Superintendent of Schools

4. Mr. Peter Gonos
   Director, Special Education Local Plan Area
   San Joaquin County Superintendent of Schools

February 16, 1982

Dr. Michael Bower
Dept. of Educational Psychology
California State Univ./Berkeley
Berkeley, California

Dear Dr. Bower:

I am a doctoral candidate at the University of the Pacific in Stockton California. I am presently in the middle stages of my dissertation study and in need of your help. Attached is an instrument which I intend to use in my data collection. For validation purposes, your name was suggested by my advisors as one with expertise in the area of special education.

My study, entitled The Program Specialist Role and Responsibilities: The Development of a Consensus Model, will survey the California Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs) to ascertain the program specialist's importance and actual function. The attached instrument, approved by my committee members is now ready for validation by experts in the field. The purpose of this instrument is to evaluate the program specialist's importance to the operation of the SELPA.

Please rate this instrument on the scale below and write in any changes you wish to suggest. Please return by February 23, 1982. Thank you for supporting on-going research.

Sincerely,

CHERYL A. McELHANY
Program Specialist

The SELPA Directors Survey/Questionnaire is:

_____ satisfactory _____ needs improvement

_____
Signature Title

Recommendations:

_____

_____

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR PERSONNEL PREPARATION

- At least 87% and 77% of the regular education elementary and secondary teachers, respectively, in the MP sample reported having at least one special education student in their classroom.
- Of the regular education teachers, more than half of the elementary teachers and more than three-fourths of the secondary teachers rated themselves as unskilled in instructing special education students.
- Regular and special education teachers in urban areas tend to be slightly more experienced than teachers in rural areas. They tend to have higher degrees, more credentials, and more teaching experience.
- In six MP areas, between 10 and 20% of the regular education elementary teachers reported having special education-related credentials. In no NMP area did more than 9% of the regular education elementary teachers report having a special education-related credential.
- Regular education elementary teachers are far more familiar with special education referral and assessment procedures than are secondary teachers. About four of every five elementary teachers are very familiar with special education programs, services, and resources. However, less than a third of all teachers are very familiar with either federal or state special education legislation and with parents' rights under these laws.
- More than 60% of the elementary MP regular education teachers reported that they are skilled in using special education resources available for students. However, less than 40% of the secondary teachers rated themselves as skilled in the use of those resources.
- Across all MP and NMP areas, less than a third of the regular education teachers reported attending inservice training programs. In MP areas, approximately two of five elementary teachers and about one of five secondary teachers reported attending inservice training programs.
- Special education teachers apparently are receiving a high level of inservice training, with 86% of all special education teachers reporting that they had attended a session during the 1978-79 school year.
- Less than one-quarter of the regular education teachers in the sample reported receiving incentives to attend inservice training, although certain incentives such as release time are provided for in the Master Plan legislation.
- More than 70% of all regular and special education teachers reported that inservice training is needed on basic assessment topics such as identification and assessment procedures. Teachers expressed the greatest need for inservice training on topics that they believe are part of their teaching role: Regular education teachers desire instruction on characteristics of special education students and more information about referring students; special education teachers expressed the need for more information on developing the IEP.
- More than half of the regular education teachers reported that they knew of only one inservice training session on an assessment topic. At least 78% of the special education teachers were aware of between two and five inservice training topics regarding assessment.

Appendix G

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON PROGRAM SERVICES AND EFFECTS

- A far higher proportion of students were identified as handicapped in MP areas than in NMP areas. The major difference was in the proportion of students identified as learning handicapped (LH) and communicatively handicapped (CH): Far more LH than CH students were in MP areas than in NMP areas.
- Because of differences in identification patterns, differences were also seen in placement patterns, with more students being served in less restrictive environments through Resource Specialist Program/Learning Disabilities Group (RSP/LDG) services in MP areas.
- Although most regular education teachers indicated that they had special education students in their classes for most or part of the day, less than 47% of the teachers in 20 of the 25 areas reported that they had Individual Education Programs (IEPs) available for these students. In three areas, virtually all the teachers said IEPs were not available to them. At the secondary level, the highest rate of response for teachers with special education students who had IEPs available was 28% in a NMP area.
- On the average, 40 to 50% of the regular education elementary and 70 to 76% of the regular education secondary teachers reported that they did not know whether the students in their classes were receiving the services outlined in the IEP.
- Between 20 and 30% of the parents reported that they did not know whether their child was receiving either all or some of the services outlined in the IEP. This varied across both MP and NMP areas, with parents in areas that had been in MP longest tending to be more knowledgeable about their child's program.
- Both parents and regular education teachers in MP areas indicated that the RS was an important resource, either in terms coordinating special education programs for students or in meeting with regular education teachers regarding the needs of special education students. Parents perceived that the RS, special and regular education teachers, and speech teacher shared responsibility in coordinating their child's program. In NMP areas, no single individual appeared to perform the same role of coordination or support for regular teachers. Of the MP elementary teachers, 77 to 85% reported that they had used the services of the RS.
- The RSP appears to be more difficult to implement effectively at the secondary level than at the elementary level, and it is more difficult to implement at both grade levels in rural areas than in suburban or urban areas.
- Across MP and NMP areas, both parents and teachers reported that they believed special education students would benefit more socially and academically from being in the regular classroom than would regular education students.
- More parents of elementary students than of secondary students believed that their child had improved (either somewhat or greatly) in terms of academic, social, and motor skills and in self-image. On the average, 60% or more of the elementary parents believed their child had improved. This did not differ significantly across MP and NMP areas.

Appendix H

Summary of the Program Specialists' Primary Responsibilities Survey (N=81)

Composite List of Job Responsibilities	No. of PS indicating this resp. was part of their job		No. of PS indicating this resp. as primary		No. of PS giving job resp. a rank of:				
	Freq.	%	f	%	1	2	3	4	5
A. CONSULTATION									
1. Consult with administrators	77	95	10	13	4	0	4	4	1
2. Consult with other multi-disciplinary personnel	74	91	9	10	2	5	0	2	1
3. Consult with parents	72	89	2	2	0	0	0	2	0
4. Consult with teachers	79	98	60	74	27	7	5	2	4
5. Interpret curriculum & instructional program to the Board of Education, the administration, the staff and the general public	51	63	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
6. Provide expertise and guidance in developing career and vocational special needs programs	52	64	5	6	1	0	0	0	5
7. Demonstration teaching	55	68	4	4	2	0	2	0	0
8. Observe students and/or total classroom environment	75	93	13	16	4	4	4	4	1
9. Locate resource materials/ equipment for teachers/ school personnel	74	91	13	16	2	5	6	0	2
10. Attend IEP meetings as a resource person	72	89	14	17	5	6	1	2	2
11. Provide consultation primarily in one specialized area or areas of your expertise	62	77	11	13	9	2	0	2	0
12. Provide for individual or small group counseling and for behavior change instruction as requested	42	52	1	1	0	0	0	2	0
13. Other (specify service)	11	14	2	2	0	0	2	0	0
B. COORDINATION									
14. Coordinate career/vocational education opportunities for students	31	38	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
15. Assist in the coordination of preschool and out-of-district referrals	57	70	6	6	1	2	2	0	1
16. Assist in coordinating special programs between and among districts	60	74	28	35	6	7	2	2	7
17. Coordinate, as appropriate, the development of IEP for students with parents and staff	71	88	21	26	6	7	4	5	2
18. Other (specify service)	16	20	2	2	0	2	0	0	0
C. COMMUNICATION									
19. Compile data for non-public school placements as requested	43	53	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
20. Assist in designing/implementing effective communication procedures/ documents for distribution to all SELPA personnel	55	68	5	6	4	2	0	0	0
21. Attend conferences, meet with other professionals, and disseminate information to school personnel	76	94	9	1	4	2	0	1	4
22. Provide liaison between parents, teachers and administrators concerning the needs and programs of IWENS	59	73	4	4	1	0	4	0	0
23. Provide liaison between districts, private schools and state schools for designated programs	52	64	3	3	2	0	0	1	0

*The RPS's agreed that many of the responsibilities were an actual part of their job; however, the number decreased when agreement on primary responsibilities was requested.

Appendix H Summary of the Program Specialists' Primary Responsibilities Survey

Composite List of Job Responsibilities	No. of PS indicating this resp. was part of their job		No. of PS indicating this resp. as primary		No. of PS giving job resp. a rank of:				
C. COMMUNICATION (Continued)	Freq.	%	f	%	1 %	2	3	4	5
24. Keeps the Director of the SELPA informed of activities and suggests new policies to improve services	63	78	5	6	2	4	0	0	0
25. Assists in the articulation of special education between all schools	68	84	12	17	0	5	5	2	5
26. Other (specify service)	5	6	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
D. STAFF & PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT									
27. Assist in assessment of needs for inservice	64	79	6	6	2	2	0	0	2
28. Plan and/or participate in each school's staff development programs, program development, and innovation of special methods and approaches	63	78	41	51	7	4	15	5	9
29. Provide classroom demonstration and model teaching on request	44	54	9	10	2	1	0	1	6
30. Develop a continuum for use in writing differential proficiency standards and assists teachers and resource specialists in the writing of differential standards	48	59	4	4	2	0	0	2	0
31. Assist teachers and Principals to develop appropriate instructional techniques within the context of the regular class curriculum and orders materials appropriate to this task	48	59	12	14	2	2	0	0	0
32. Participate in ongoing development and revision of curriculum framework handbooks for teachers of children with learning handicaps	43	53	2	2	0	0	1	1	0
33. Presents inservice/workshops in areas of expertise upon request	64	79	19	23	2	4	7	5	1
34. Other (specify service)	3	6	3	3	0	0	0	2	1
E. SUPPORT									
35. Assist in interpretation of assessment data for developing/modifying instructional plans	73	96	8	9	5	0	1	1	2
36. Assist in the gathering of regional data related to pupil count, special studies pupil history, information etc.	53	65	7	9	1	7	0	0	4
37. Assist in the supervision of the special education materials center operation	27	33	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
38. Work with the Special Olympic Committee to continue its on-going program for the retarded	14	17	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
39. Assist in, provide for, and actively participate in the dept.'s Race/Human Relations Program	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
40. Assist in parent training and establishing effective communications	46	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
41. Review and help in writing of grants	39	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
42. Encourage implementation of innovative special methods and approaches for individuals with exceptional needs	64	79	8	7	1	0	0	7	1

Appendix H Summary of the Program Specialists' Primary Responsiblities Survey

Composite List of Job Responsibilities	No. of PS indicating this resp. was part of their job		No. of PS indicating this resp. as primary		No. of PS giving job resp. a rank of: 1	2	3	4	5
	Freq.	%	f	%	%				
E. SUPPORT (Continued)									
43. Other (specify service)	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F. COMPLIANCE									
44. Monitor the implementation and evaluation of the IEP program as necessary and appropriate	65	80	18	22	2	5	2	2	7
45. Provide assistance in order to assure that pupils have full educational opportunity regardless of the district of residence, such as: attend IEP meeting re: placement change, gather data for Complaint or Due Process; follow-up of Complaint or Due Process	73	90	32	40	7	5	10	7	5
46. Maintain knowledge of current laws & regulations pertaining to IWENS and may be assigned to prepare fair hearing material	56	69	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
47. Monitors compliance with Federal, State and Regional guidelines	52	64	6	6	0	2	2	2	0
48. Other (specify service)	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G. MANAGEMENT									
49. Develop a record-keeping system which will track all services & mandated follow-up. Maintain case records on referred students as appropriate	46	57	16	20	5	2	0	5	6
50. Serve as the Special Education transportation representative	20	25	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
51. Propose appropriate budget requisites	26	32	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
52. Establish, maintain & support standards of personal conduct & discipline in accordance with the current discipline policy	35	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
53. Other (specify service)	9	11	7	8	6	0	2	2	0
H. SUPERVISORY									
54. Interview and participate in the selection of candidates for SELPA teaching positions	41	51	6	7	7	0	0	0	0
55. Supervise & evaluate assigned clerical personnel staff	26	32	4	5	5	0	0	0	0
56. Supervise & evaluate assigned clerical personnel staff	35	43	2	2	1	0	1	0	0
57. Assist & supervise student teachers & interns used in special classes	26	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
58. Provide direct supervision and program coordination to assigned special education teachers and resource specialists	42	52	12	14	5	5	2	2	0
59. Serve as administrative designee to SAT referrals for county-class placement and IEP meetings of county special day classes, within assigned geographical areas	39	48	3	3	1	0	0	0	2
60. Other (specify service)	5	6	2	2	2	0	0	0	0

Appendix H Summary of the Program Specialists' Primary Responsibilities Survey (N-81)

Composite List of Job Responsibilities	No. of PS indicating this resp. was part of their job		No. of PS indicating this resp. as primary		No. of PS giving job resp. a rank of:				
	Freq.	%	f	%	1	2	3	4	5
I. EVAUATION									
61. Review program/pupil progress and recommend program revisions when appropriate/directed	69	85	16	20	2	2	4	6	4
62. Assist in assessing effectiveness of district programs for the handicapped	58	72	4	4	0	0	0	2	2
63. Prepare annual and interim reports as directed	39	48	2	2	0	0	0	0	2
64. Give input to building administrators for evaluation of resource specialists and SDC teachers	44	54	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
65. Other (specify service)	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix I

The "Other" Section Responses of the Primary Responsibilities of the Program Specialist Survey

The responses in the "other" categories for the areas of Consultation and Evaluation were as follows:

1) Coordinate Bilingual Individual Learning Program for students with their IEPs.
2) Coordinate Community Advisory Council.
3) Coordinate transitional programs.
4) Assist with state required evaluation plan.
5) Design and implement evaluation studies.
6) Assist in program review process.